

# The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 58, St. Albans Road, Edinburgh.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

## Board of Management:

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

Prof. A. G. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A.  
Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A.  
Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.  
Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A.  
Prof. E. WILLIAMSON, M.A. (Hon. Treasurer).

Representing the Council of the Classical Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (Hon. Secretary), representing the Oxford Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. W. J. WOODHOUSE, University of Sydney.

Vol. XLVII

SEPTEMBER, 1933

No. 4

## CONTENTS

|  | PAGE |   | PAGE |
|--|------|---|------|
| ELEGIAC VERSES. J. A. FORT .. ..   | 113  | REVIEWS (continued):  |      |
| SOPHRON AND THEOCRITUS. A. S. F. GOW   | 113  | <i>A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions</i>                         |      |
| TRIBRACHS IN GREEK DRAMATIC VERSE.   |      | (Tod). A. W. GOMME .. ..  | 132  |
| H. D. BROADHEAD .. ..  | 115  | <i>Hérodote</i> (Legrand). G. C. WHITTICK ..                                | 134  |
| PREPARATION AND MOTIVATION IN GREEK  |      | Προϊστορικὴ Ἑλευσίς (Mylonas). A. J. B.                                     |      |
| TRAGEDY. T. B. L. WEBSTER .. ..  | 117  | WACE .. ..  | 135  |
| ΚΟΙΝΩΤΙΑΣ AND ΒΟΤΚΕΦΑΛΟΣ. J. L.  |      | <i>Greek Coins</i> (Seltman). H. MATTINGLY ..                               | 136  |
| MYRES .. ..  | 124  | <i>Isocrate: Il Panegirico</i> (Treves). M. L. W.                           |      |
| BEDE AND VEGETIUS. G. MACDONALD ..   | 124  | LAISTNER .. ..  | 137  |
| REVIEWS:   |      | <i>Agape and Eros</i> (Nygren). A. L. PECK ..                               | 137  |
| <i>Nuova Antologia dei Frammenti della Livica</i>                                    |      | <i>Aristotle: The Politics</i> (Rackham). W. D.                             |      |
| <i>greca</i> (Lavagnini). C. M. BOWRA ..   | 125  | ROSS .. ..  | 139  |
| <i>The Odes of Pindar rendered in English Verse</i>                                  |      | <i>Flaminisches und Attisches</i> (Jachmann), etc.                          |      |
| (Murison). E. S. FORSTER .. ..   | 125  | W. BEARE .. ..  | 140  |
| <i>New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature: Third Series</i> (Powell). D. S. |      | <i>Sallustio</i> (Cesareo). H. LAST .. ..                                   | 141  |
| ROBERTSON .. ..  | 126  | <i>Virgilio Minore</i> (Rostagni). D. L. DREW                               | 142  |
| <i>L'Ame hellénique d'après les Vases grecs</i>                                      |      | <i>Doppelprinzipat und Reichsteilung</i> (Kornemann). M. P. CHARLESWORTH .. | 143  |
| (Méautis). T. B. L. WEBSTER .. ..  | 127  | <i>The Theory of Speech and Language</i> (Gardiner)                         |      |
| <i>Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen und altheil-</i>                             |      | P. S. NOBLE .. ..   | 146  |
| <i>lenischen Gesetzgebung</i> (Mühl). W. W.  |      | <i>Mythology . . . in English Poetry</i> (Bush).                            |      |
| TARN .. ..   | 128  | <i>Classical Mythology in Spenser</i> (Lotspeich).                          |      |
| <i>Caravan Cities and Out of the Past of Greece</i>                                  |      | H. J. ROSE .. ..  | 147  |
| <i>and Rome</i> (Rostovtzeff). W. W. TARN ..   | 129  | SHORT REVIEWS .. ..   | 148  |
| <i>The Discovery of the Ancient World</i> (Burton).                                  |      | CORRESPONDENCE .. ..  | 153  |
| E. H. WARMINGTON .. ..   | 130  | SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS .. ..  | 153  |
| <i>Saggio sulla Storiografia</i> (Lavagnini), <i>History</i>                         |      | BOOKS RECEIVED .. ..  | 157  |
| <i>as a Science</i> (Taylor). A. W. GOMME ..   | 131  |   |      |

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 2s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s.; combined subscription £1 1s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. F. C. G. Langford, 35, Alleyn Park, Dulwich, S.E. 21. Inquiries should be sent to The Triangle Offices, 61, South Molton Street, W. 1, addressed either to the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Miss E. C. Gedge and Mr. R. M. Rattenbury) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

THE TEXT VOLUME OF

### THE MINIATURES OF THE MANUSCRIPTS of TERENCE

PRIOR TO THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

By L. W. JONES and C. R. MOREY

THIS volume is the commentary on the complete corpus of the Terence miniatures, comprising almost 800 reproductions, which appeared last year. The text volume affords a complete description of each manuscript and an analysis of its illustration, providing also such determination as is possible of the date and provenance of each codex, and the particular variety of mediaeval style which is represented by its illustrations. The concluding chapter summarizes the findings of the authors, and includes a presentation of the descent of the illustrative tradition in Terence manuscripts, as well as a discussion of the relative value of the manuscripts as representatives of the archetype which was written and illustrated in the fifth century A.D.

*The two volumes together are priced at £9 17s. 6d. net. They are sold separately at the price of £4 net for the text volume and £5 11s. 6d. net for the volume of plates.*

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS  
Amen House London, E.C. 4

### Murray's Classical Atlas For Schools

Edited by G. B. Grundy, M.A., D.Litt.

Consisting of 83 Maps and Plans. Folio (14½ × 9½ ins.). The maps in this atlas have been most carefully prepared so as to accentuate all the chief names and natural features of the countries. In the new edition all the maps have been thoroughly revised and some new contours have been added.

SECOND EDITION. 9s. net.

### A CONCISE DICTIONARY OF GREEK & ROMAN ANTIQUITIES

Based on Sir Wm. Smith's larger Dictionary, and incorporating the results of modern research. Edited by F. Warre Cornish, M.A. 25s. net

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE ST., W. 1

nd  
on  
nal  
to  
ate

ual  
5s.  
ngs  
cal  
cal  
ion  
aid  
ual

Mr.  
t to  
on.  
r to  
yth,  
eds,  
orth  
ern,

S

itt.  
olio  
ave  
en-  
ares  
the  
ome

N

1

The  
cri  
τὸ  
pre  
(a  
ma  
On  
Ka  
me  
rel  
th  
θe  
th  
It  
is  
de  
ha  
by  
ev  
th  
its  
ti

at  
ev  
fi  
fr  
rl

a



# The Classical Review

SEPTEMBER, 1933

## ELEGIAC VERSES.

Ἡρέμ' ὑπὲρ τύμβοιο Σοφοκλέος, ἡρέμα, κισσέ,  
 Ἐρπύζους χλοερούς ἐκπροχέων πλοκάμους,  
 Καὶ πέταλον πάντη θάλλοι ῥόδου, ἥ τε φίλορρῶξ  
 Ἀμπελος ἡγρὰ πέριξ κλήματα χευαμένη,  
 Εὔνεκεν εὐπέης πινυτόφρονος, ἦν ὁ μελιχρὸς  
 Ἦσκησ' ἐκ Μουσῶν ἀμμιγα καὶ Χαρίτων.

SIMMIAS.

Quietly over the grave of Sophocles, quietly ever  
 Creep, sweet ivy, and spread; wreath it for ever with green.  
 There may the rose too bloom, there freely the clustering grape-vine  
 Climb, and its soft shoots twine tenderly over the dead.  
 Wisdom and beauty of words did the Muses and Graces together  
 Give to him; sweet was his song; nay, it was honey itself.

J. A. FORT.

## SOPHRON AND THEOCRITUS.

THE scholia to the second Idyll of Theocritus assert, at l. 69, that Theocritus has borrowed from Sophron τὴν τῶν φαρμάκων ὑπόθεσιν, and, in the preface, they criticize as 'tasteless' (ἀπειροκάλως) his transference of the maid Thestylis from the same author. On the strength of these assertions, Kaibel collected together seven fragments of Sophron which refer, or may refer, to magic, and assigned them to the mime entitled *Ταὶ γυναῖκες αἱ τὰν θεῶν φαντι ἐξελάν*, from which one of them is cited by Athenaeus (II. 480 b). It has been generally assumed that this is the mime to which Theocritus is indebted, and a good deal of ingenuity has been expended upon it, especially by R. Wünsch and R. Herzog;<sup>1</sup> but even if these suppositions are correct, the evidence is insufficient to determine its subject or even the meaning of its title.

The purpose of this note is to call attention to an important piece of new evidence, and to add, very briefly, some first reflexions upon it. A papyrus from E. Breccia's excavations at Oxyrhynchus, from its inclusion of one of

the above-mentioned fragments, was recognized by M. Norsa and G. Vitelli in April of this year as part of a mime of Sophron, and has been published by them, with commendable promptitude, in *Stud. Ital. di Fil. Class.* vol. 10 p. 119. Their transcript of the first substantial fragment of Sophron to come down to us is as follows:

τὰν τράπεζαν κάθεται  
 ὥσπερ ἔχει· λάξασθε δὲ  
 ἄλλος χόνδρον ἐς τὰν χῆρα  
 καὶ δάφναν παρ τὸ ὄμα.  
 5 ποτιβάντες νυν πότ τὰν  
 ἱστίαν θυκαίτε· δὸς μοι τὸ  
 τῶμφακες· φέρ' ὃ τὰν σκύλακα·  
 πεί γὰρ ἂς ἀσφαλτος; : οὐτά :  
 ἔχε καὶ τὸ δάιδιον, καὶ τὸν  
 10 λιβανωτὴν· ἀγετε δὴ  
 πεπτάσθων μοι ταὶ θύραι  
 πάσαι· ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐνταῦθα  
 ὀρήγε· καὶ τὸν δαελόν  
 σβῆτε ὥσπερ ἔχει· εὐκᾶε<sup>1</sup>  
 15 νυν παρέχεσθε ἄσφ[  
 πόν τὰνδε<sup>2</sup>ε<sup>3</sup>ε<sup>4</sup>ε<sup>5</sup>ε<sup>6</sup>ε<sup>7</sup>ε<sup>8</sup>ε<sup>9</sup>ε<sup>10</sup>ε<sup>11</sup>ε<sup>12</sup>ε<sup>13</sup>ε<sup>14</sup>ε<sup>15</sup>ε<sup>16</sup>ε<sup>17</sup>ε<sup>18</sup>ε<sup>19</sup>ε<sup>20</sup>ε<sup>21</sup>ε<sup>22</sup>ε<sup>23</sup>ε<sup>24</sup>ε<sup>25</sup>ε<sup>26</sup>ε<sup>27</sup>ε<sup>28</sup>ε<sup>29</sup>ε<sup>30</sup>ε<sup>31</sup>ε<sup>32</sup>ε<sup>33</sup>ε<sup>34</sup>ε<sup>35</sup>ε<sup>36</sup>ε<sup>37</sup>ε<sup>38</sup>ε<sup>39</sup>ε<sup>40</sup>ε<sup>41</sup>ε<sup>42</sup>ε<sup>43</sup>ε<sup>44</sup>ε<sup>45</sup>ε<sup>46</sup>ε<sup>47</sup>ε<sup>48</sup>ε<sup>49</sup>ε<sup>50</sup>ε<sup>51</sup>ε<sup>52</sup>ε<sup>53</sup>ε<sup>54</sup>ε<sup>55</sup>ε<sup>56</sup>ε<sup>57</sup>ε<sup>58</sup>ε<sup>59</sup>ε<sup>60</sup>ε<sup>61</sup>ε<sup>62</sup>ε<sup>63</sup>ε<sup>64</sup>ε<sup>65</sup>ε<sup>66</sup>ε<sup>67</sup>ε<sup>68</sup>ε<sup>69</sup>ε<sup>70</sup>ε<sup>71</sup>ε<sup>72</sup>ε<sup>73</sup>ε<sup>74</sup>ε<sup>75</sup>ε<sup>76</sup>ε<sup>77</sup>ε<sup>78</sup>ε<sup>79</sup>ε<sup>80</sup>ε<sup>81</sup>ε<sup>82</sup>ε<sup>83</sup>ε<sup>84</sup>ε<sup>85</sup>ε<sup>86</sup>ε<sup>87</sup>ε<sup>88</sup>ε<sup>89</sup>ε<sup>90</sup>ε<sup>91</sup>ε<sup>92</sup>ε<sup>93</sup>ε<sup>94</sup>ε<sup>95</sup>ε<sup>96</sup>ε<sup>97</sup>ε<sup>98</sup>ε<sup>99</sup>ε<sup>100</sup>ε<sup>101</sup>ε<sup>102</sup>ε<sup>103</sup>ε<sup>104</sup>ε<sup>105</sup>ε<sup>106</sup>ε<sup>107</sup>ε<sup>108</sup>ε<sup>109</sup>ε<sup>110</sup>ε<sup>111</sup>ε<sup>112</sup>ε<sup>113</sup>ε<sup>114</sup>ε<sup>115</sup>ε<sup>116</sup>ε<sup>117</sup>ε<sup>118</sup>ε<sup>119</sup>ε<sup>120</sup>ε<sup>121</sup>ε<sup>122</sup>ε<sup>123</sup>ε<sup>124</sup>ε<sup>125</sup>ε<sup>126</sup>ε<sup>127</sup>ε<sup>128</sup>ε<sup>129</sup>ε<sup>130</sup>ε<sup>131</sup>ε<sup>132</sup>ε<sup>133</sup>ε<sup>134</sup>ε<sup>135</sup>ε<sup>136</sup>ε<sup>137</sup>ε<sup>138</sup>ε<sup>139</sup>ε<sup>140</sup>ε<sup>141</sup>ε<sup>142</sup>ε<sup>143</sup>ε<sup>144</sup>ε<sup>145</sup>ε<sup>146</sup>ε<sup>147</sup>ε<sup>148</sup>ε<sup>149</sup>ε<sup>150</sup>ε<sup>151</sup>ε<sup>152</sup>ε<sup>153</sup>ε<sup>154</sup>ε<sup>155</sup>ε<sup>156</sup>ε<sup>157</sup>ε<sup>158</sup>ε<sup>159</sup>ε<sup>160</sup>ε<sup>161</sup>ε<sup>162</sup>ε<sup>163</sup>ε<sup>164</sup>ε<sup>165</sup>ε<sup>166</sup>ε<sup>167</sup>ε<sup>168</sup>ε<sup>169</sup>ε<sup>170</sup>ε<sup>171</sup>ε<sup>172</sup>ε<sup>173</sup>ε<sup>174</sup>ε<sup>175</sup>ε<sup>176</sup>ε<sup>177</sup>ε<sup>178</sup>ε<sup>179</sup>ε<sup>180</sup>ε<sup>181</sup>ε<sup>182</sup>ε<sup>183</sup>ε<sup>184</sup>ε<sup>185</sup>ε<sup>186</sup>ε<sup>187</sup>ε<sup>188</sup>ε<sup>189</sup>ε<sup>190</sup>ε<sup>191</sup>ε<sup>192</sup>ε<sup>193</sup>ε<sup>194</sup>ε<sup>195</sup>ε<sup>196</sup>ε<sup>197</sup>ε<sup>198</sup>ε<sup>199</sup>ε<sup>200</sup>ε<sup>201</sup>ε<sup>202</sup>ε<sup>203</sup>ε<sup>204</sup>ε<sup>205</sup>ε<sup>206</sup>ε<sup>207</sup>ε<sup>208</sup>ε<sup>209</sup>ε<sup>210</sup>ε<sup>211</sup>ε<sup>212</sup>ε<sup>213</sup>ε<sup>214</sup>ε<sup>215</sup>ε<sup>216</sup>ε<sup>217</sup>ε<sup>218</sup>ε<sup>219</sup>ε<sup>220</sup>ε<sup>221</sup>ε<sup>222</sup>ε<sup>223</sup>ε<sup>224</sup>ε<sup>225</sup>ε<sup>226</sup>ε<sup>227</sup>ε<sup>228</sup>ε<sup>229</sup>ε<sup>230</sup>ε<sup>231</sup>ε<sup>232</sup>ε<sup>233</sup>ε<sup>234</sup>ε<sup>235</sup>ε<sup>236</sup>ε<sup>237</sup>ε<sup>238</sup>ε<sup>239</sup>ε<sup>240</sup>ε<sup>241</sup>ε<sup>242</sup>ε<sup>243</sup>ε<sup>244</sup>ε<sup>245</sup>ε<sup>246</sup>ε<sup>247</sup>ε<sup>248</sup>ε<sup>249</sup>ε<sup>250</sup>ε<sup>251</sup>ε<sup>252</sup>ε<sup>253</sup>ε<sup>254</sup>ε<sup>255</sup>ε<sup>256</sup>ε<sup>257</sup>ε<sup>258</sup>ε<sup>259</sup>ε<sup>260</sup>ε<sup>261</sup>ε<sup>262</sup>ε<sup>263</sup>ε<sup>264</sup>ε<sup>265</sup>ε<sup>266</sup>ε<sup>267</sup>ε<sup>268</sup>ε<sup>269</sup>ε<sup>270</sup>ε<sup>271</sup>ε<sup>272</sup>ε<sup>273</sup>ε<sup>274</sup>ε<sup>275</sup>ε<sup>276</sup>ε<sup>277</sup>ε<sup>278</sup>ε<sup>279</sup>ε<sup>280</sup>ε<sup>281</sup>ε<sup>282</sup>ε<sup>283</sup>ε<sup>284</sup>ε<sup>285</sup>ε<sup>286</sup>ε<sup>287</sup>ε<sup>288</sup>ε<sup>289</sup>ε<sup>290</sup>ε<sup>291</sup>ε<sup>292</sup>ε<sup>293</sup>ε<sup>294</sup>ε<sup>295</sup>ε<sup>296</sup>ε<sup>297</sup>ε<sup>298</sup>ε<sup>299</sup>ε<sup>300</sup>ε<sup>301</sup>ε<sup>302</sup>ε<sup>303</sup>ε<sup>304</sup>ε<sup>305</sup>ε<sup>306</sup>ε<sup>307</sup>ε<sup>308</sup>ε<sup>309</sup>ε<sup>310</sup>ε<sup>311</sup>ε<sup>312</sup>ε<sup>313</sup>ε<sup>314</sup>ε<sup>315</sup>ε<sup>316</sup>ε<sup>317</sup>ε<sup>318</sup>ε<sup>319</sup>ε<sup>320</sup>ε<sup>321</sup>ε<sup>322</sup>ε<sup>323</sup>ε<sup>324</sup>ε<sup>325</sup>ε<sup>326</sup>ε<sup>327</sup>ε<sup>328</sup>ε<sup>329</sup>ε<sup>330</sup>ε<sup>331</sup>ε<sup>332</sup>ε<sup>333</sup>ε<sup>334</sup>ε<sup>335</sup>ε<sup>336</sup>ε<sup>337</sup>ε<sup>338</sup>ε<sup>339</sup>ε<sup>340</sup>ε<sup>341</sup>ε<sup>342</sup>ε<sup>343</sup>ε<sup>344</sup>ε<sup>345</sup>ε<sup>346</sup>ε<sup>347</sup>ε<sup>348</sup>ε<sup>349</sup>ε<sup>350</sup>ε<sup>351</sup>ε<sup>352</sup>ε<sup>353</sup>ε<sup>354</sup>ε<sup>355</sup>ε<sup>356</sup>ε<sup>357</sup>ε<sup>358</sup>ε<sup>359</sup>ε<sup>360</sup>ε<sup>361</sup>ε<sup>362</sup>ε<sup>363</sup>ε<sup>364</sup>ε<sup>365</sup>ε<sup>366</sup>ε<sup>367</sup>ε<sup>368</sup>ε<sup>369</sup>ε<sup>370</sup>ε<sup>371</sup>ε<sup>372</sup>ε<sup>373</sup>ε<sup>374</sup>ε<sup>375</sup>ε<sup>376</sup>ε<sup>377</sup>ε<sup>378</sup>ε<sup>379</sup>ε<sup>380</sup>ε<sup>381</sup>ε<sup>382</sup>ε<sup>383</sup>ε<sup>384</sup>ε<sup>385</sup>ε<sup>386</sup>ε<sup>387</sup>ε<sup>388</sup>ε<sup>389</sup>ε<sup>390</sup>ε<sup>391</sup>ε<sup>392</sup>ε<sup>393</sup>ε<sup>394</sup>ε<sup>395</sup>ε<sup>396</sup>ε<sup>397</sup>ε<sup>398</sup>ε<sup>399</sup>ε<sup>400</sup>ε<sup>401</sup>ε<sup>402</sup>ε<sup>403</sup>ε<sup>404</sup>ε<sup>405</sup>ε<sup>406</sup>ε<sup>407</sup>ε<sup>408</sup>ε<sup>409</sup>ε<sup>410</sup>ε<sup>411</sup>ε<sup>412</sup>ε<sup>413</sup>ε<sup>414</sup>ε<sup>415</sup>ε<sup>416</sup>ε<sup>417</sup>ε<sup>418</sup>ε<sup>419</sup>ε<sup>420</sup>ε<sup>421</sup>ε<sup>422</sup>ε<sup>423</sup>ε<sup>424</sup>ε<sup>425</sup>ε<sup>426</sup>ε<sup>427</sup>ε<sup>428</sup>ε<sup>429</sup>ε<sup>430</sup>ε<sup>431</sup>ε<sup>432</sup>ε<sup>433</sup>ε<sup>434</sup>ε<sup>435</sup>ε<sup>436</sup>ε<sup>437</sup>ε<sup>438</sup>ε<sup>439</sup>ε<sup>440</sup>ε<sup>441</sup>ε<sup>442</sup>ε<sup>443</sup>ε<sup>444</sup>ε<sup>445</sup>ε<sup>446</sup>ε<sup>447</sup>ε<sup>448</sup>ε<sup>449</sup>ε<sup>450</sup>ε<sup>451</sup>ε<sup>452</sup>ε<sup>453</sup>ε<sup>454</sup>ε<sup>455</sup>ε<sup>456</sup>ε<sup>457</sup>ε<sup>458</sup>ε<sup>459</sup>ε<sup>460</sup>ε<sup>461</sup>ε<sup>462</sup>ε<sup>463</sup>ε<sup>464</sup>ε<sup>465</sup>ε<sup>466</sup>ε<sup>467</sup>ε<sup>468</sup>ε<sup>469</sup>ε<sup>470</sup>ε<sup>471</sup>ε<sup>472</sup>ε<sup>473</sup>ε<sup>474</sup>ε<sup>475</sup>ε<sup>476</sup>ε<sup>477</sup>ε<sup>478</sup>ε<sup>479</sup>ε<sup>480</sup>ε<sup>481</sup>ε<sup>482</sup>ε<sup>483</sup>ε<sup>484</sup>ε<sup>485</sup>ε<sup>486</sup>ε<sup>487</sup>ε<sup>488</sup>ε<sup>489</sup>ε<sup>490</sup>ε<sup>491</sup>ε<sup>492</sup>ε<sup>493</sup>ε<sup>494</sup>ε<sup>495</sup>ε<sup>496</sup>ε<sup>497</sup>ε<sup>498</sup>ε<sup>499</sup>ε<sup>500</sup>ε<sup>501</sup>ε<sup>502</sup>ε<sup>503</sup>ε<sup>504</sup>ε<sup>505</sup>ε<sup>506</sup>ε<sup>507</sup>ε<sup>508</sup>ε<sup>509</sup>ε<sup>510</sup>ε<sup>511</sup>ε<sup>512</sup>ε<sup>513</sup>ε<sup>514</sup>ε<sup>515</sup>ε<sup>516</sup>ε<sup>517</sup>ε<sup>518</sup>ε<sup>519</sup>ε<sup>520</sup>ε<sup>521</sup>ε<sup>522</sup>ε<sup>523</sup>ε<sup>524</sup>ε<sup>525</sup>ε<sup>526</sup>ε<sup>527</sup>ε<sup>528</sup>ε<sup>529</sup>ε<sup>530</sup>ε<sup>531</sup>ε<sup>532</sup>ε<sup>533</sup>ε<sup>534</sup>ε<sup>535</sup>ε<sup>536</sup>ε<sup>537</sup>ε<sup>538</sup>ε<sup>539</sup>ε<sup>540</sup>ε<sup>541</sup>ε<sup>542</sup>ε<sup>543</sup>ε<sup>544</sup>ε<sup>545</sup>ε<sup>546</sup>ε<sup>547</sup>ε<sup>548</sup>ε<sup>549</sup>ε<sup>550</sup>ε<sup>551</sup>ε<sup>552</sup>ε<sup>553</sup>ε<sup>554</sup>ε<sup>555</sup>ε<sup>556</sup>ε<sup>557</sup>ε<sup>558</sup>ε<sup>559</sup>ε<sup>560</sup>ε<sup>561</sup>ε<sup>562</sup>ε<sup>563</sup>ε<sup>564</sup>ε<sup>565</sup>ε<sup>566</sup>ε<sup>567</sup>ε<sup>568</sup>ε<sup>569</sup>ε<sup>570</sup>ε<sup>571</sup>ε<sup>572</sup>ε<sup>573</sup>ε<sup>574</sup>ε<sup>575</sup>ε<sup>576</sup>ε<sup>577</sup>ε<sup>578</sup>ε<sup>579</sup>ε<sup>580</sup>ε<sup>581</sup>ε<sup>582</sup>ε<sup>583</sup>ε<sup>584</sup>ε<sup>585</sup>ε<sup>586</sup>ε<sup>587</sup>ε<sup>588</sup>ε<sup>589</sup>ε<sup>590</sup>ε<sup>591</sup>ε<sup>592</sup>ε<sup>593</sup>ε<sup>594</sup>ε<sup>595</sup>ε<sup>596</sup>ε<sup>597</sup>ε<sup>598</sup>ε<sup>599</sup>ε<sup>600</sup>ε<sup>601</sup>ε<sup>602</sup>ε<sup>603</sup>ε<sup>604</sup>ε<sup>605</sup>ε<sup>606</sup>ε<sup>607</sup>ε<sup>608</sup>ε<sup>609</sup>ε<sup>610</sup>ε<sup>611</sup>ε<sup>612</sup>ε<sup>613</sup>ε<sup>614</sup>ε<sup>615</sup>ε<sup>616</sup>ε<sup>617</sup>ε<sup>618</sup>ε<sup>619</sup>ε<sup>620</sup>ε<sup>621</sup>ε<sup>622</sup>ε<sup>623</sup>ε<sup>624</sup>ε<sup>625</sup>ε<sup>626</sup>ε<sup>627</sup>ε<sup>628</sup>ε<sup>629</sup>ε<sup>630</sup>ε<sup>631</sup>ε<sup>632</sup>ε<sup>633</sup>ε<sup>634</sup>ε<sup>635</sup>ε<sup>636</sup>ε<sup>637</sup>ε<sup>638</sup>ε<sup>639</sup>ε<sup>640</sup>ε<sup>641</sup>ε<sup>642</sup>ε<sup>643</sup>ε<sup>644</sup>ε<sup>645</sup>ε<sup>646</sup>ε<sup>647</sup>ε<sup>648</sup>ε<sup>649</sup>ε<sup>650</sup>ε<sup>651</sup>ε<sup>652</sup>ε<sup>653</sup>ε<sup>654</sup>ε<sup>655</sup>ε<sup>656</sup>ε<sup>657</sup>ε<sup>658</sup>ε<sup>659</sup>ε<sup>660</sup>ε<sup>661</sup>ε<sup>662</sup>ε<sup>663</sup>ε<sup>664</sup>ε<sup>665</sup>ε<sup>666</sup>ε<sup>667</sup>ε<sup>668</sup>ε<sup>669</sup>ε<sup>670</sup>ε<sup>671</sup>ε<sup>672</sup>ε<sup>673</sup>ε<sup>674</sup>ε<sup>675</sup>ε<sup>676</sup>ε<sup>677</sup>ε<sup>678</sup>ε<sup>679</sup>ε<sup>680</sup>ε<sup>681</sup>ε<sup>682</sup>ε<sup>683</sup>ε<sup>684</sup>ε<sup>685</sup>ε<sup>686</sup>ε<sup>687</sup>ε<sup>688</sup>ε<sup>689</sup>ε<sup>690</sup>ε<sup>691</sup>ε<sup>692</sup>ε<sup>693</sup>ε<sup>694</sup>ε<sup>695</sup>ε<sup>696</sup>ε<sup>697</sup>ε<sup>698</sup>ε<sup>699</sup>ε<sup>700</sup>ε<sup>701</sup>ε<sup>702</sup>ε<sup>703</sup>ε<sup>704</sup>ε<sup>705</sup>ε<sup>706</sup>ε<sup>707</sup>ε<sup>708</sup>ε<sup>709</sup>ε<sup>710</sup>ε<sup>711</sup>ε<sup>712</sup>ε<sup>713</sup>ε<sup>714</sup>ε<sup>715</sup>ε<sup>716</sup>ε<sup>717</sup>ε<sup>718</sup>ε<sup>719</sup>ε<sup>720</sup>ε<sup>721</sup>ε<sup>722</sup>ε<sup>723</sup>ε<sup>724</sup>ε<sup>725</sup>ε<sup>726</sup>ε<sup>727</sup>ε<sup>728</sup>ε<sup>729</sup>ε<sup>730</sup>ε<sup>731</sup>ε<sup>732</sup>ε<sup>733</sup>ε<sup>734</sup>ε<sup>735</sup>ε<sup>736</sup>ε<sup>737</sup>ε<sup>738</sup>ε<sup>739</sup>ε<sup>740</sup>ε<sup>741</sup>ε<sup>742</sup>ε<sup>743</sup>ε<sup>744</sup>ε<sup>745</sup>ε<sup>746</sup>ε<sup>747</sup>ε<sup>748</sup>ε<sup>749</sup>ε<sup>750</sup>ε<sup>751</sup>ε<sup>752</sup>ε<sup>753</sup>ε<sup>754</sup>ε<sup>755</sup>ε<sup>756</sup>ε<sup>757</sup>ε<sup>758</sup>ε<sup>759</sup>ε<sup>760</sup>ε<sup>761</sup>ε<sup>762</sup>ε<sup>763</sup>ε<sup>764</sup>ε<sup>765</sup>ε<sup>766</sup>ε<sup>767</sup>ε<sup>768</sup>ε<sup>769</sup>ε<sup>770</sup>ε<sup>771</sup>ε<sup>772</sup>ε<sup>773</sup>ε<sup>774</sup>ε<sup>775</sup>ε<sup>776</sup>ε<sup>777</sup>ε<sup>778</sup>ε<sup>779</sup>ε<sup>780</sup>ε<sup>781</sup>ε<sup>782</sup>ε<sup>783</sup>ε<sup>784</sup>ε<sup>785</sup>ε<sup>786</sup>ε<sup>787</sup>ε<sup>788</sup>ε<sup>789</sup>ε<sup>790</sup>ε<sup>791</sup>ε<sup>792</sup>ε<sup>793</sup>ε<sup>794</sup>ε<sup>795</sup>ε<sup>796</sup>ε<sup>797</sup>ε<sup>798</sup>ε<sup>799</sup>ε<sup>800</sup>ε<sup>801</sup>ε<sup>802</sup>ε<sup>803</sup>ε<sup>804</sup>ε<sup>805</sup>ε<sup>806</sup>ε<sup>807</sup>ε<sup>808</sup>ε<sup>809</sup>ε<sup>810</sup>ε<sup>811</sup>ε<sup>812</sup>ε<sup>813</sup>ε<sup>814</sup>ε<sup>815</sup>ε<sup>816</sup>ε<sup>817</sup>ε<sup>818</sup>ε<sup>819</sup>ε<sup>820</sup>ε<sup>821</sup>ε<sup>822</sup>ε<sup>823</sup>ε<sup>824</sup>ε<sup>825</sup>ε<sup>826</sup>ε<sup>827</sup>ε<sup>828</sup>ε<sup>829</sup>ε<sup>830</sup>ε<sup>831</sup>ε<sup>832</sup>ε<sup>833</sup>ε<sup>834</sup>ε<sup>835</sup>ε<sup>836</sup>ε<sup>837</sup>ε<sup>838</sup>ε<sup>839</sup>ε<sup>840</sup>ε<sup>841</sup>ε<sup>842</sup>ε<sup>843</sup>ε<sup>844</sup>ε<sup>845</sup>ε<sup>846</sup>ε<sup>847</sup>ε<sup>848</sup>ε<sup>849</sup>ε<sup>850</sup>ε<sup>851</sup>ε<sup>852</sup>ε<sup>853</sup>ε<sup>854</sup>ε<sup>855</sup>ε<sup>856</sup>ε<sup>857</sup>ε<sup>858</sup>ε<sup>859</sup>ε<sup>860</sup>ε<sup>861</sup>ε<sup>862</sup>ε<sup>863</sup>ε<sup>864</sup>ε<sup>865</sup>ε<sup>866</sup>ε<sup>867</sup>ε<sup>868</sup>ε<sup>869</sup>ε<sup>870</sup>ε<sup>871</sup>ε<sup>872</sup>ε<sup>873</sup>ε<sup>874</sup>ε<sup>875</sup>ε<sup>876</sup>ε<sup>877</sup>ε<sup>878</sup>ε<sup>879</sup>ε<sup>880</sup>ε<sup>881</sup>ε<sup>882</sup>ε<sup>883</sup>ε<sup>884</sup>ε<sup>885</sup>ε<sup>886</sup>ε<sup>887</sup>ε<sup>888</sup>ε<sup>889</sup>ε<sup>890</sup>ε<sup>891</sup>ε<sup>892</sup>ε<sup>893</sup>ε<sup>894</sup>ε<sup>895</sup>ε<sup>896</sup>ε<sup>897</sup>ε<sup>898</sup>ε<sup>899</sup>ε<sup>900</sup>ε<sup>901</sup>ε<sup>902</sup>ε<sup>903</sup>ε<sup>904</sup>ε<sup>905</sup>ε<sup>906</sup>ε<sup>907</sup>ε<sup>908</sup>ε<sup>909</sup>ε<sup>910</sup>ε<sup>911</sup>ε<sup>912</sup>ε<sup>913</sup>ε<sup>914</sup>ε<sup>915</sup>ε<sup>916</sup>ε<sup>917</sup>ε<sup>918</sup>ε<sup>919</sup>ε<sup>920</sup>ε<sup>921</sup>ε<sup>922</sup>ε<sup>923</sup>ε<sup>924</sup>ε<sup>925</sup>ε<sup>926</sup>ε<sup>927</sup>ε<sup>928</sup>ε<sup>929</sup>ε<sup>930</sup>ε<sup>931</sup>ε<sup>932</sup>ε<sup>933</sup>ε<sup>934</sup>ε<sup>935</sup>ε<sup>936</sup>ε<sup>937</sup>ε<sup>938</sup>ε<sup>939</sup>ε<sup>940</sup>ε<sup>941</sup>ε<sup>942</sup>ε<sup>943</sup>ε<sup>944</sup>ε<sup>945</sup>ε<sup>946</sup>ε<sup>947</sup>ε<sup>948</sup>ε<sup>949</sup>ε<sup>950</sup>ε<sup>951</sup>ε<sup>952</sup>ε<sup>953</sup>ε<sup>954</sup>ε<sup>955</sup>ε<sup>956</sup>ε<sup>957</sup>ε<sup>958</sup>ε<sup>959</sup>ε<sup>960</sup>ε<sup>961</sup>ε<sup>962</sup>ε<sup>963</sup>ε<sup>964</sup>ε<sup>965</sup>ε<sup>966</sup>ε<sup>967</sup>ε<sup>968</sup>ε<sup>969</sup>ε<sup>970</sup>ε<sup>971</sup>ε<sup>972</sup>ε<sup>973</sup>ε<sup>974</sup>ε<sup>975</sup>ε<sup>976</sup>ε<sup>977</sup>ε<sup>978</sup>ε<sup>979</sup>ε<sup>980</sup>ε<sup>981</sup>ε<sup>982</sup>ε<sup>983</sup>ε<sup>984</sup>ε<sup>985</sup>ε<sup>986</sup>ε<sup>987</sup>ε<sup>988</sup>ε<sup>989</sup>ε<sup>990</sup>ε<sup>991</sup>ε<sup>992</sup>ε<sup>993</sup>ε<sup>994</sup>ε<sup>995</sup>ε<sup>996</sup>ε<sup>997</sup>ε<sup>998</sup>ε<sup>999</sup>ε<sup>1000</sup>ε<sup>1001</sup>ε<sup>1002</sup>ε<sup>1003</sup>ε<sup>1004</sup>ε<sup>1005</sup>ε<sup>1006</sup>ε<sup>1007</sup>ε<sup>1008</sup>ε<sup>1009</sup>ε<sup>1010</sup>ε<sup>1011</sup>ε<sup>1012</sup>ε<sup>1013</sup>ε<sup>1014</sup>ε<sup>1015</sup>ε<sup>1016</sup>ε<sup>1017</sup>ε<sup>1018</sup>ε<sup>1019</sup>ε<sup>1020</sup>ε<sup>1021</sup>ε<sup>1022</sup>ε<sup>1023</sup>ε<sup>1024</sup>ε<sup>1025</sup>ε<sup>1026</sup>ε<sup>1027</sup>ε<sup>1028</sup>ε<sup>1029</sup>ε<sup>1030</sup>ε<sup>1031</sup>ε<sup>1032</sup>ε<sup>1033</sup>ε<sup>1034</sup>ε<sup>1035</sup>ε<sup>1036</sup>ε<sup>1037</sup>ε<sup>1038</sup>ε<sup>1039</sup>ε<sup>1040</sup>ε<sup>1041</sup>ε<sup>1042</sup>ε<sup>1043</sup>ε<sup>1044</sup>ε<sup>1045</sup>ε<sup>1046</sup>ε<sup>1047</sup>ε<sup>1048</sup>ε<sup>1049</sup>ε<sup>1050</sup>ε<sup>1051</sup>ε<sup>1052</sup>ε<sup>1053</sup>ε<sup>1054</sup>ε<sup>1055</sup>ε<sup>1056</sup>ε<sup>1057</sup>ε<sup>1058</sup>ε<sup>1059</sup>ε<sup>1060</sup>ε<sup>1061</sup>ε<sup>1062</sup>ε<sup>1063</sup>ε<sup>1064</sup>ε<sup>1065</sup>ε<sup>1066</sup>ε<sup>1067</sup>ε<sup>1068</sup>ε<sup>1069</sup>ε<sup>1070</sup>ε<sup>1071</sup>ε<sup>1072</sup>ε<sup>1073</sup>ε<sup>1074</sup>ε<sup>1075</sup>ε<sup>1076</sup>ε<sup>1077</sup>ε<sup>1078</sup>ε<sup>1079</sup>ε<sup>1080</sup>ε<sup>1081</sup>ε<sup>1082</sup>ε<sup>1083</sup>ε<sup>1084</sup>ε<sup>1085</sup>ε<sup>1086</sup>ε<sup>1087</sup>ε<sup>1088</sup>ε<sup>1089</sup>ε

to Hekate (17, cf. Sophr. fr. 8).<sup>1</sup> The first word in l. 7 is written τῶμφᾶκες; I take it to be τὸ ἀμφήκες, one of the sacrificial knives.<sup>2</sup> The mark over the ω stands elsewhere for an accent; it may stand here for the coronis, but the papyrus, though its accents are few, has false ones on δάδιον (if not on πάσαι) and implies another on χόνδρον. The passage is written as though it were verse, but the metre, if metre it is, escapes me. In 14 f. I suggest εὐκ[αλεία]ν<sup>3</sup> | νῦν παρέχεσθε ᾧς κ[α] ἐπάσω. The prayer or incantation seems to begin in 16; ξείων, which, if the ε is firm, seems certain in 18, points in 17 to δειπνον or -ων and to a reference to the δειπνον Ἐκάτης;<sup>4</sup> I have failed, however, to restore these lines to my satisfaction within the limits imposed. The scene is apparently the interior of a house.<sup>5</sup>

Herzog's reconstruction of the mime Ταὶ γυναῖκες κ.τ.λ. assumed, on the evidence of schol. Theocr. 2. 11, that it dealt with the purification of Hekate herself by the Kabeiroi. It is not obvious how the fragment could be fitted into such a theme, and, whether or no that was the subject of Ταὶ γυναῖκες κ.τ.λ., there is, as the editors observe, a difficulty in supposing that the fragment comes from that mime. Sophron's mimes were classified, possibly by their author, as Ἀνδρείοι or Γυναικεῖοι,<sup>6</sup> and, though the precise meaning of the classification is not

clear, Ταὶ γυναῖκες κ.τ.λ. presumably belonged to the latter class. In the fragment there is nothing to show that the speaker and the laconic attendant in 8 are women,<sup>7</sup> and the sex of the rest is settled by the masculine participle in l. 5.

The Doric adverb πεῖ interested grammarians, and the phrase πεῖ γὰρ ἄσφαλτος; (8) is quoted three times by Apollonius Dyscolus (*de adu.* 542, 622, 625) without the author's name. Ammonius (*de diff.* 122) has: πεῖ τὴν ἐν τόπῳ σχέσιν δηλοῖ. Σώφρων· πεῖ γὰρ ἄσφαλτος; ποῖος εἰλισκοπεῖται. The last two words were ingeniously emended by Kaibel, from Theocr. 2. 19, to ποῖ (or πῶς), Θεστυλί, σκοπή τῷ; and the whole (with ἄ borrowed from Apollonius) appears as fragment 5 and is assigned to the mime Ταὶ γυναῖκες κ.τ.λ. It is now plain, however, that if ποῖος εἰλισκοπεῖται conceals a citation from Sophron, we must choose between two alternatives. Either the citation is not from the immediate context of the preceding words; if so, it should probably contain a second example of πεῖ, and even if Kaibel was right in connecting it with Theocr. 2. 19, we cannot be sure that the words come from the same mime as the new fragment. Or, alternatively and not so probably, the words belong together but come from another passage. And, after all, though it may be probable that the two references to Theocritus's borrowings in his scholia relate to the same mime, it is no more than an inference that they do so. The current explanation<sup>8</sup> of the charge of tastelessness preferred against Theocritus's use of Thestylis is that it consisted in silencing a character who, in Sophron, was vocal. This explanation, however, is a mere guess (to which the new fragment, whatever view we take of it, lends no support), and it is as likely, if guess we must, that the alleged fault consisted in transferring her to a new context.

The resemblance between the fragment and Theocr. 2. 1-63 is not close,

<sup>1</sup> For salt in purification see Theocr. 24. 97, Tib. 3. 4. 10, Eitrem, *Opferritus* p. 323; for laurel, Abt, *Apol. d. Apul.* p. 79, Diels, *Sibyll. Blatt.* p. 120; for pitch, Phot. *s.vv.* μαρὰ ἡμέρα, βάμνος and, in fumigations, *Geop.* 12. 8. 1 *al.*; for dog-sacrifice, Plut. *Mor.* 280b. With the possible exception of the last, these could be explained from love-magic, but love-magic is essentially a secret affair. For the quenched torch in purification cf. Eur. *Her.* 928; for the open doors, perhaps Suid. *s.v.* θύραζε.

<sup>2</sup> On the Pan-painter's Busiris pelike (Beazley, *Der Panmaler* 8 and p. 12) one of the attendants at the sacrifice carries what seems to be a case of eight knives. I understand the speaker here to be asking for the two-edged knife from the set.

<sup>3</sup> Hesych. *s.v.*, L. and S<sup>2</sup>. *s.v.* εὐκαμία.

<sup>4</sup> Schol. Ar. *Pl.* 594, Plut. *Mor.* 709a; cf. Sophr. fr. 27.

<sup>5</sup> For the doors (11) cf. Lysias 12. 16.

<sup>6</sup> Suid. *s.v.* Σώφρων, Ath. 7. 281e, Pap. Ox. 2. 301; cf. Choric. *de mim.* 16, Pl. *Rep.* 451c.

<sup>7</sup> One of the smaller fragments is θύραν τὰν αἰὶς ἐκ[, but the visible sex need not be that of the speaker.

<sup>8</sup> It is Fritzsche's; cf. Jahn in *Hermes* 2, p. 239.

but there is some general likeness; and it seems quite possible that, whatever may have been the theme and title of the mime there imitated by Theocritus, this is a piece of it.<sup>1</sup> If that is the case, the fragment, so far as it goes, confirms the conclusion, already probable on other grounds, that Theocritus's borrowings were superficial. That Theocritus's subject should, in the fifth century, have been handled as he handles it is agreed to be inconceivable;

<sup>1</sup> I do not put it more strongly because, if this is a purificatory sacrifice, the words of the scholiast τὴν τῶν φαρμάκων ὑπόθεσιν . . . μεταφέρει present an obvious difficulty.

nor is it possible, as is sometimes said, to distinguish between the incantation (1-63) and the monologue which succeeds it. The romance and pathos of the latter are essential elements also in the incantation, which, without them, would be a mere series of ritual acts and prayers. For these, and for the preparations which precede them, some hints may well have been borrowed from Sophron; it seems unlikely that the debt can go beyond that, and if this is the passage imitated, the hints were distant indeed.

A. S. F. Gow.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

### TRIBRACHS IN GREEK DRAMATIC VERSE.

PROFESSOR MURRAY and Mr Dale have recently discussed the treatment of tribrachs like πατέρα in Greek dramatic verse. Mr Dale (C.R. XLIII, p. 165) concludes from his statistics that the tragedians 'use at will either [πατέρα] or πατέ|ρα' and holds that pronunciation of the accents is essential for an appreciation of the variety in the iambic trimeter. With this latter statement I cordially agree, as may be seen from my book *Latin Prose Rhythm*, p. 42, where I remark that 'in Greek accent is not a determining factor in rhythm, though, of course, it would give great variety to one rhythm.' But I cannot agree with Mr Dale's views on the pronunciation of πατέρα. What exactly does he mean by saying 'if πατέ|ρα sounded more effective in any kind of verse than [πατέρα]' etc? Does he suppose that because the word-chopping metrical groups syllables in 'feet,' and dissects πατέρα in two different ways, therefore πατέρα was pronounced differently to suit the 'scansion' of the line? Or does he mean that the word πατέρα was pronounced in only one way, but that the effect differs according to its position in the line?

I might be excused if I attributed to Mr Dale the former view, since Professor Murray also seems to hold it when he writes (C.R. XLIV, p. 6), 'I should be inclined on the whole to believe that (1) the trochaic scansion

was decidedly the more usual and therefore *probably nearer to the normal pronunciation*, but (2) the preference was so slight that it *could readily be dropped* for almost any good motive' (italics mine). Surely the italicized words imply at least two possible pronunciations of πατέρα in dramatic verse, though one is regarded as much more frequent than the other. Professor Murray (*ib.* p. 5) also says 'the tribrach must be *treated* either as a trochee or as an iambus.' What exactly does the word 'treated' mean? Treated by the metrical or pronounced by the speaker?

Both Professor Murray and Mr Dale are, I take it, anxious to recapture the ancient pronunciation or rather rhythmization of the syllables in a word like πατέρα, and I believe that the Greek dramatists afford valuable evidence which, if rightly used, can throw much light on the pronunciation of ancient Greek. But Mr Dale and Professor Murray do not seem to have realized the importance of distinguishing between the 'rhythmical' and the 'metrical' point of view. (See my *op. cit.* p. 39 ff., and article in C.Q. XXVI.) Briefly, the distinction is this: to rhythmize is to control the flow of syllables in such a way that we are conscious of definite groupings. Such groupings inevitably occur whenever language is spoken or read mentally aloud, and (with rare exceptions) the



groupings are fixed and constant, whether we express our thoughts in prose or in spoken (as opposed to 'sung') verse. For example, 'ambiguities,' 'arbitraberis,' ἐμφανέστατος, all exhibit the same grouping of syllables. To make our hearers sensible of any other grouping would be to mutilate or to murder the pronunciation. The *rhythm* of these words may then be described as -υ+--υ (the last syllable is 'anceps' where we have no context).

But if ἐμφανέστατος (say) occurs in an iambic trimeter, the metrician's eyes see a different grouping. Thus, in

λόγος δὲ τοῖς φρονούσιν ἐμφανέστατος

he finds | -σιν ἐμ|φανέσ|τατος |, i.e. three iambs. Similarly, in English verse, if 'ambiguities' came at the end of a 'five-foot' line, it would be scanned as am-bigu-ities. But such groupings do not represent a live reality. If the line is properly pronounced, 'ambiguities' is still -υ+--υ, not -+υ-+υ, i.e. the rhythmical grouping is still the same, though it is customary for 'scansion' purposes to find other groupings. What then does 'scansion' or the metrical point of view do for us? It gives an objective statement of fact, and this fact is the sequence of long and short syllables (in Greek) and the number of syllables or accented syllables (in English). In the 'normal' iambic trimeter of Sophocles we find twelve syllables, and (if we omit for the moment resolutions and various irregularities) there is a certain uniformity in the succession of longs and shorts; for the third, seventh and eleventh syllables are always short, while the even syllables are always long, except, of course, the twelfth, which may be either short or long (anceps). Or we can describe this fact in other ways, e.g. we can say with the metrician that the second, fourth and sixth pairs always show the quantities --. Or again we may say that the twelve syllables may be grouped in fours, and that each group of four exhibits the quantities --υ-. All such descriptions are true to fact, but they do not of themselves enlighten us as to how the syllables were rhythimized in

normal pronunciation. I hope my distinction between the rhythmical and the metrical point of view is now clear. The same word may occur in various metrical contexts and undergo divers experiences at the hands of the metrician; but all the time it can be pronounced correctly in only one way. The art of the poet is shown in the skilful way he sets words in the metrical framework without doing violence to the normal pronunciation.

In the light of the above brief discussion I should deal with the tribrachs thus: πατέρα in normal pronunciation was rhythimized as a resolved trochee, and in the iambic trimeter it is generally found in such a position that the first two syllables represent the more usual long syllable. If, however, the last two syllables represent the normal long, we are not to conclude that πατέρα was rhythimized as υυυ. It was still pronounced as a resolved trochee, but, inasmuch as the typical iambic trimeter has its even syllables long, the lilt of the line is somewhat disturbed if we find an even long syllable replaced by two short syllables which do not naturally cohere to form a unit in ordinary pronunciation. Thus, πατέρα = υυυ, i.e. the word is rhythimized as a resolved trochee; if it occurs in a position in the iambic trimeter where we expect υυυ, we are sensible of a conflict between the rhythm of the word and the lilt of the line. This explains why πατέρα occurs oftener in positions where the word-rhythm agrees with the line-rhythm. But the conflict is felt far less than would be the case if, instead of υ-, we substituted -υ, which in time is equivalent to υυυ. The reason why υυυ is tolerated and -υ not, is that the time-ratio of -υ is 2/1, whereas with the tribrach it approaches 1/1/1, although the first two were conceived as forming one unit of two times. In other words, the trochaic character of υυυ is not so decided for the ear as -υ, owing to the spreading out, as it were, of the times. The fact that πατέρα occurs more often in such a position that the first two syllables re-

place the normal long clearly indicates, as Professor Murray says, that the Greeks had a preference in the matter; but I cannot believe that the word, in whatsoever part of the line it occurred, was pronounced otherwise than as a resolved trochee.

We are not unfamiliar with the phenomenon of 'inversion' in English verse, where, however, much greater liberty is allowed than in classical poetry. Compare Sonnenschein, *What is Rhythm?* pp. 110 and 116. In the line

Petulant she spoke, and at herself she laughed  
the first word produces an effect similar to that produced by *πατέρα* in the Sophoclean line (*Electra* 279)

*πατέρα τὸν ἄμὼν ἐκ δόλου κατέκτανεν.*

Although the first syllable of the English word bears a stress accent, the parallel is exact enough for my purpose.

'Petulant' is  $\bar{\omega}\omega \times$ , not  $\omega \omega \times$ , just as *πατέρα* is  $\bar{\omega}\omega \omega$ , not  $\omega \omega \omega$ . With 'petulant' in the second foot we could compare Aristophanes, *Birds* 1364

*τὸν μὲν πατέρα μὴ τύπτε· ταυτηνδὶ λαβὼν —.*

My study of the iambic trimeter has convinced me that *Philoctetes* 1314

*ἦσθην πατέρα τε τὸν ἐμὸν εὐλογοῦντά σε*

is quite different from the examples considered above. The enclitic *τε* coheres, rhythmically at any rate, with the preceding word, so that the natural rhythmization would be  $\omega\omega\omega\omega$ . But the whole question of tribrachs should form part of a general discussion of resolution in the Greek iambic trimeter, and I hope to give the results of my investigations in a future paper.

In conclusion, I would submit (i) that the pitch accent has no influence on the rhythmization of Greek words; (ii) that the first syllable of tribrachs like *πατέρα* may have received a stress

accent, though there is no direct evidence for this; (iii) that the absence of such a stress accent does not justify the assumption that *πατέρα* could be rhythmized iambically as well as trochaically (cf. *C.O.* XXVI, pp. 41, 43).

H. D. BROADHEAD.

Canterbury College,  
Christchurch, N.Z.

ADDENDUM.—Since writing the above I have received the summary of Mr E. Harrison's paper entitled *Τριβραχυλογικά* (*Cambridge University Reporter*, 8 March 1932). Mr Harrison's figures make it abundantly clear that the 'trochaic scansion' of tribrachs was far more usual than the iambic. Words like *πατέρα* are scanned in the tragic trimeter generally as  $\bar{\omega}\omega \omega$  (366 as against 147  $\omega \bar{\omega}$ ), while for words like *δόλιος* ( $\omega\omega\omega$ ) the figures are 803 ( $\bar{\omega}\omega \omega$ ) as against 97 ( $\omega \bar{\omega}$ ). So the poets prefer to place tribrachs in such a position in the line that the first two syllables correspond to the normal long. Why should this strong preference exist if the tribrachs in common speech were not rhythmized as resolved trochees?

Further, I see not the slightest need to assume that they were, either in common speech or in dramatic verse, rhythmized as resolved iambi. I find it perfectly easy and natural in the line *ἀνὴρ ὁμογενὴς καὶ χάριτας ἔχων πατρός* (*Eur. Or.* 244) to pronounce *χάριτας* as  $\bar{\omega}\omega \omega$  (not  $\omega \bar{\omega}$ ). We should not dream of mispronouncing an English line containing, say, an inversion of accent; why then should we regard it as necessary in Greek?

Mr Harrison's paper deals also with words shaped like *γενομένων* or *ποτάμιος*. Consideration of these, however, I must at present omit, as this article is concerned only with trisyllabic words.

H. D. B.

#### PREPARATION AND MOTIVATION IN GREEK TRAGEDY.

IN an article in the *Classical Review* (1932, p. 146) I said unguardedly, 'The arrival of a Sophoclean character is expected; Euripidean characters arrive unexpectedly, and when they come they may give their reasons for coming.'

This was indignantly challenged by a lover of Euripides, who accused me of unfairness. But I had not intended to make a judgement of value; I had intended to point out a difference in kind. This difference in kind I am going to

try and establish by examining how the entrances of characters and chorus are prepared, and what reasons they give for their coming. I am going to examine the second question, motivation of entries, first, because it is smaller and can be considered more briefly. If the entry of a character has been adequately prepared, there is little need for him to say why he has come. If he arrives in answer to a summons, that is sufficient reason in itself. If he leaves home on an errand, he may be expected to come back;<sup>1</sup> if he goes into a house, he may be expected to come out of it again. But if the preparation is weak, the motivation should be strong; Eurydice in the *Antigone* (1183) explains how she was coming out of the house to sacrifice when she overheard the messenger, and many Euripidean choruses say that they have come to give the heroine their help or sympathy. The choruses of his *Electra* and *Hypsipyle* give other reasons, chance events that are not connected with the action on the stage, and similarly Orestes in the *Andromache* (885) explains that he happens to be on the way to Dodona and therefore could conveniently visit his kinswoman Hermione.<sup>2</sup> Strong and explicit motivation goes with weak preparation, weak and implicit motivation with strong preparation. Euripides likes strong and realistic motivation, and often, for he likes formulae, uses the formula *ἦ καὶ* and the participle; his characters explain why they have come.

Preparation needs more careful study. There are various ways in which the audience may be prepared for what is coming, for what is going to happen, or for who is going to arrive. I shall examine first these forms of preparation for themselves, and later examine their place in, and their influence on, the structure of the play. I shall first consider the preparation for the entry and action of the chorus. The entrance of the chorus is prepared in the three plays of the *Oresteia*, four times in Sophocles and only seven times in Euripides, whose earliest prepared *parodos* is in

the *Supplices*. In the *Agamemnon*, *Ajax* and *Antigone* a statement is made or a command given, the execution of which is the reason for the appearance of the chorus; for instance, in the *Ajax* Odysseus is told in the prologue to spread the rumour of Ajax' madness among all the Argives, then the chorus come to see what is happening to Ajax, because they have heard this rumour. In the prologues of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* and the *Oedipus Coloneus*, a messenger is sent to summon the chorus. This is the strongest form of preparation. The Euripidean forms are different. In the *Ion*, Ion says that visitors may come to the temple and then the chorus arrive. In the *Iphigenia in Tauris* Iphigenia wonders why the chorus have not come; after sixty lines they arrive. In the *Phaethon*, *Phoenissae* and *Orestes* the chorus are seen coming by the characters on the stage; so also in the *Epileptontes* of Menander, where it has become a formula—'we must go, there are some drunks coming.' In Euripides' *Supplices* (and possibly in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*) the chorus are seen in the orchestra at the beginning of the play. In the *Troades* and the *Bacchae* the chorus are within earshot, for they are called upon by one of the characters to sing a particular song. This last is the most ancient form of the relation between actor and chorus; the actor is the *ἐξάρχων* of the chorus. It survives in other parts of the play besides the *parodos*; for instance, in the *Trachiniae* (202) Deianeira calls upon the chorus to sing a joyful song to celebrate the return of Heracles.<sup>3</sup> In the *Agamemnon* (351) the leader of the chorus himself tells the chorus what to sing. In *Agamemnon* (524) and *Alcestis* (610) the original form is lost, the chorus are told what to sing but do not sing it immediately. Similarly there are two forms of the relation between the actor and the chorus. The old form survives in the *Supplices* of Aeschylus (197 and 246), where the actor gives the chorus explicit instructions how to behave; in later plays the actor tells the chorus

<sup>1</sup> E.g. A. *Septem* 372; S. O.T. 911, *Trach.* 393, *Phil.* 730; E. *Ion* 510, 517, 725, *El.* 112, *Hel.* 528, *Or.* 1323.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Alc.* 481 f., *Med.* 683 f., *H.F.* 1163 f.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. A. *Suppl.* 520, *Pers.* 620; E. *Hipp.* 58, 1098, *El.* 694. The form of preparation for the *parodos* of the *Phaethon* is an additional reason for dating it late.



what to do, but how they do it is left to them; the command to keep silent about a plot is most common.<sup>1</sup> But the close connection between chorus and actor is revived by Euripides and late Sophocles.<sup>2</sup> This is part of the love of realistic representation which characterizes the last quarter of the fifth century. The chorus is again drawn into the action of the play. It is a return to the spectacles of Aeschylus. The chorus is in the orchestra during the prologue of Euripides' *Supplikes*; Hecuba is on the stage, silent, during the prologue of the *Troades*; Orestes is silent during the prologue and the *parodos* of the *Orestes*. This is not unlike the statuesque figures of Aeschylus 'who uttered not a grunt.' To sum up, in preparing for the chorus Euripides uses weak forms, Sophocles uses strong forms; Euripides revives Aeschylean types; in their later plays both Sophocles and Euripides draw the chorus into the action.

All the forms of preparation for the entry of the chorus and more are used to prepare the entry of characters. Preparation by sight (the character is seen or heard coming) is a weak form, especially when used alone, but is perhaps the most interesting. A new arrival may come from inside the house or palace or from off the stage; he may be seen by character or chorus; his arrival may be announced to character, chorus, or the audience. The announcement is only dramatic if the person who makes it can see the arrival and the person to whom it is made cannot, or if the announcement is made in such a way as to change the course of the action; it is undramatic if its only purpose is to inform the audience of the name of the character who is arriving. I have counted forty instances of this last type in Euripides, against six in Sophocles (all in early plays) and four in Aeschylus. In considering the dramatic instances the arrangement of the Greek stage must be taken into account; if a character is looking towards the

palace he can see someone coming out of it before the chorus can, but if two characters are talking on the stage, they are facing the audience and the chorus can see someone coming out before they can; the same is true of a character arriving from elsewhere. In all these cases the announcement may be dramatic. There are two large classes which may be called the *καὶ μὴν* class and the *ἀλλὰ γὰρ* class; the former is a simple announcement, in the latter the action is interrupted because someone is coming. Both can be used as empty formulae; at the end of a choral ode an arrival does not interrupt the song, yet the chorus may say *ἀλλὰ γὰρ*, and the chorus may have no one to address but the audience, yet they may say *καὶ μὴν*. The announcement to the audience can be made dramatic by elaboration, as in Euripides' *Supplikes* (980), where a whole tableau is described, Sophocles' *Antigone* (376), where the chorus doubt if it is really Antigone, or as in the prologues of the *Hippolytus*, *Hecuba* and *Ion*, where the *ἀλλὰ γὰρ* form motives the character's departure. The most dramatic use of the *καὶ μὴν* form is made by Aeschylus in the *Supplikes* (234, 826), where the character sees someone coming in the distance and tells the chorus, and some time afterwards the arrival takes place. This is continued by Sophocles, when he makes a character watch for an expected arrival during a chorus and announces at the end that he is coming.<sup>3</sup> The announcement to a character, as the announcement to the audience, can be made more dramatic by a description<sup>4</sup> (the most exciting description is of Orestes and Pylades coming out of the house to be purified by Iphigenia) or by the expression of doubt, e.g. the arrival of Heracles in the *Hercules Furens* (514) and of Ismene in the *Oedipus Coloneus* (310). Ismene is also described at length; these full descriptions of characters in the late plays are not unconnected with the realistic school of portraiture which we know to have flourished at the end of the fifth century, and generally with

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. Cho. 581; S. Trach. 596, El. 468; E. Med. 259, Hipp. 710, Ion 666, I.T. 1063, Hel. 1387, I.A. 542.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. E. Hipp. 777, El. 218, Or. 1251; S. El. 1398, Phil. 135, O.C. 112.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Trach. 225, O.T. 1110, O.C. 720; once by Euripides, Med. 1116.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Tro. 230, 568, 1119, Phoen. 1330, I.T. 1222.

the love of realistic action which we have already noticed. Finally some special instances of the *καὶ μὴν* form. In the *Oedipus Tyrannus* (78), Oedipus says 'I am amazed that Creon has not come yet,' the priest answers 'This man has just told me that he can see him coming'; this is dramatic, and has the effect of speeding up the play; it is repeated for the arrival of Tiresias (297).<sup>1</sup> At the end of the play (1416) Oedipus is blind and the chorus has to tell him that Creon is coming; in the *Bacchae* (210) Cadmus says 'As you are blind, Tiresias, I will tell you that Pentheus is coming'; in the *Oedipus Coloneus* again Oedipus is blind and the *καὶ μὴν* form is used six times, more often than in any other play of Sophocles. Secondly the *ἀλλὰ γὰρ* form, which is more than twice as common in Sophocles as in Euripides. It is very effective when one party sees someone whom the rest cannot see; in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* (631) the chorus see Iocasta coming out of the house sooner than Oedipus and Creon, who are quarrelling.<sup>2</sup> To sum up, these two forms of preparation are at first used with great dramatic effect, but even in the time of Aeschylus they can be mere formulae; they are formulae in the *Antigone* and usually in Euripides; in the other plays of Sophocles they are nearly always used dramatically, and occasionally in Euripides; in the later plays of both they are used in close connection with realistic action; in them we have a miniature history of Greek tragedy and its double advance towards formalism and realism.

Preparation by sight, which we have been discussing, can only be used in the scene in which the character who is seen or heard coming appears on the stage. The other forms of preparation can be used any length of time before the character appears. There are the following forms: name, hint, possibility, statement, intention, and command. The first three are weak forms, the last three strong. All these forms are chiefly interesting in combinations with other forms, but first there are some special instances to be considered. There is a

neat preparation by name in the *Antigone* (215). Creon says to the chorus 'You must be watchers of my words,' *Chor.* 'Lay this burden on some younger man.' *Cr.* 'Oh, there are watchers of the corpse already.' Five lines later the watchman appears and we know who he is.<sup>3</sup> Preparation by hint is rare; in the *Ion* (153), Ion says 'May I never cease serving Apollo, or may I cease if it be with good fortune'; this hints at the later development of the play.<sup>4</sup> Preparation by possibility, where a character says that something may happen, is common, but is a weak form when used alone. Statement that something will happen is a strong form, and naturally used most by seers in Sophocles and by gods in Euripidean prologues. Preparation by intention and preparation by command frequently go together; A tells B to do something and B says that he intends to do it. Therefore they can be taken together, and there are some special instances which are worth noting. The watchman in the *Antigone* (329) says that he will never come back and face Creon again, and this is the preparation for his return in the next scene; there are two other cases of this inverse preparation in early Sophocles.<sup>5</sup> Not unlike this are the cases where a character proposes to do something which would make it impossible for the play to proceed, and is prevented; I have only noticed one in Euripides: in the *Ion* (334) Ion stops Creusa asking the oracle about the child which she had exposed. There are several in Sophocles: for instance, in the *Philoctetes* (534) Philoctetes is not allowed to start off for Neoptolemus' ship, and thus the presentation of Philoctetes' sickness and Neoptolemus' repentance are made possible.<sup>6</sup> The audience know that the play cannot end with Neoptolemus leading Philoctetes off to his ship and are keyed up to see what is going to happen. Sophocles, recognizing that the intellect of his audience is always likely to be wakeful, particularly under the conditions of the Athenian theatre,

<sup>3</sup> Cf. A. *Sept.* 36.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. S. *Ant.* 745.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. S. *Aj.* 594, 971, and E. *Or.* 787.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Trach.* 333, 389, *El.* 986, *Phil.* 533, 850.

<sup>1</sup> This may be the source of similar uses in Euripides, *Suppl.* 395, *Tro.* 294, *Phoen.* 695.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. S. *El.* 1430, *Phil.* 202; E. *Hipp.* 567.

makes use of it to obtain a peculiar emotional reaction; dramatic irony is exactly the same thing: the spectator relates his knowledge of the story to the words of the character on the stage; this is three-dimensional composition. Similarly in his *Electra* we remember that Orestes has put a lock of hair on Agamemnon's tomb, and when Chrysothemis goes there we know that she will find it and come back with it; in the *Oedipus Coloneus* we know that Ismene has gone to make sacrifice and therefore fear that she may have been captured when we see Creon arrive.<sup>1</sup> There are most examples of command and intention in the later plays of Sophocles and Euripides; that is the result of the love of realistic action which we have already mentioned. In Sophocles it<sup>2</sup> is usually the violent action of the characters: Neoptolemus and Odysseus draw on one another, Philoctetes prepares to shoot Odysseus. Euripides likes tableaux and spectacles and therefore frequent orders to *parachoregemata*,<sup>3</sup> as Aeschylus before him. This examination of the forms of preparation in detail has shown us the formalism of Euripides, the difference between the realism of Euripides and that of Sophocles, and Sophocles' peculiar sense of the dramatic; we must now examine the forms of preparation in their relation to each other and to the whole play.

First I will give some statistics. The actual number of entries increases in Aeschylus from five in the *Persae* to eleven in the *Eumenides*, decreases in Sophocles from seventeen in the *Ajax* to eight in the *Philoctetes*; in Euripides the minimum is eleven in the *Hecuba*, the maximum nineteen in the *Iphigenia in Aulis*; the character-play of Sophocles has less movement than the melodrama of Euripides, and the Sophoclean hero stays on the stage for most of the play. The proportion of preparations to entries varies between six preparations to five entries and five preparations to three entries in Aeschylus; in Sophocles the proportion increases from two to

one in the *Antigone* to five to two in the *Philoctetes* and *Electra*; Euripides never reaches the proportion two to one, though the *Medea* and the *Hippolytus*, both written under the influence of Sophocles, and the latter, I think, under the direct influence of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, are nearest to it; the lowest are one to one in the *Supplices* and seven to eight in the *Iphigenia in Tauris*. These figures are some justification for my contention that Sophoclean characters are expected and Euripidean characters arrive unexpectedly. But we must examine in detail first cases of weak preparation and secondly cases of strong preparation.

There are five notable cases of weak preparation in Sophocles, three of them in the *Antigone*. Haemon is only named in the scene before he arrives and is seen coming; the only preparation for the arrival of Tiresias is the hint in Haemon's speech (693), 'The city laments this maiden, how that of all women least deserving this, she perishes most miserably, though her deeds are most noble'; there is no preparation for the arrival of Eurydice except that she is seen coming. In the *Oedipus Tyrannus* Creon's arrival (512) is prepared by Oedipus' suspicions in the scene before, the arrival of the Corinthian messenger by Oedipus' narrative of his relation to the king and queen of Corinth. We are not surprised by any of these arrivals and they start no new action. It is different when we examine Euripides.

In Euripides there are two important unprepared entries, the servant who enters before the second entry of Heracles in the *Alcestis* (747), and the nurse who enters before the second entry of Hermione in the *Andromache* (802); both occur at points where the direction of the action is changed. The entry of the servant who is going to tell Heracles that it is Alcestis who is dead starts the action in a new direction, the rescue of Alcestis. The entry of Hermione starts a new action, and this next act centres round her instead of Andromache; in the act after this Peleus appears; the only preparation is Hermione's fear that Peleus might pursue her; and with the entry of Peleus there is another twist

<sup>1</sup> S. *El.* 404, O.C. 507. Cf. E. *Hec.* 609.

<sup>2</sup> See *Cl. Rev.*, 1931, p. 148, n. 7.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. *Tro.* 1260, *El.* 360, 998, *I.T.* 725, 1205, *Hel.* 865, 1180.



in the action: the interest now centres round the fortunes of Neoptolemus. There is another play that is constructed like the *Andromache*, the *Hercules Furens*; here too there are three separate actions, the rescue of Megara, the madness of Heracles, the reconciliation of Heracles; here too the second and the third actions are started by a weak entry, the madness of Heracles by the entry of Iris and Lyssa, who are seen coming by the chorus, the reconciliation by the arrival of Theseus, who has been named four scenes before and is now seen coming by Heracles. Other entries which mark a turning-point in the action but are weakly prepared are (1) the arrival of Aegeus in the *Medea* (663): two scenes before the arrival of Aegeus, Medea asks for a day in which to consider the possibilities of escape; later in the same scene she says 'If there appear for me any tower of safety'; we have in our minds the possibility of someone coming who will provide Medea with an asylum; then Aegeus appears; (2) the arrival of the old slave in the *Ion* (735): Creusa names him as she leads him on, otherwise there is no preparation; but his arrival gives the action a new direction, for he suggests that she should poison Ion (which Ion has stated as a possibility in the scene before), and this attempt leads up to the recognition; (3) the arrival of Menelaus in the *Troades*: he has been named in the prologue and the *parodos*, but his arrival, otherwise unprepared, starts a new action, the contest between Helen and Hecuba. This list could be lengthened, but these instances are enough to show that Euripides likes unexpected twists in the action and likes the character who causes them to arrive unexpectedly.

Secondly we must examine those entries which are prepared several times and long before they occur. In Aeschylus there is only one case of an entry which is prepared four scenes before it occurs: Xerxes is named in the prologue of the *Persae* and appears in the last scene. In Sophocles there are nine such entries in all, in Euripides only eight, less than half as many if the number of extant plays is taken into account. Sophocles has six entries which are prepared five scenes ahead,

Euripides has seven, and Sophocles has one preparation six scenes before the entry. The figures suggest that Sophocles prepares his entries more carefully than Euripides. Similarly in the case of number of preparations per entry, in Sophocles there is one entry with six preparations, none in Aeschylus or Euripides; in Sophocles there are five entries with five preparations, none in Aeschylus or Euripides. For entries with fewer preparations the figures are more equal, but it is noticeable that in Sophocles' *Electra* there is only one entry with a single preparation, the lowest figure for any one play; the highest is ten in Euripides' *Suppliants*.

But it is necessary to go into greater detail and consider the quality of the preparation, where an entry is prepared several times and long before. The most carefully prepared entry in Aeschylus is that of Agamemnon in the *Agamemnon*; he is seen coming by the chorus, the herald announces his coming in the scene before that, and the possibility of his coming is stated by the watchman in the prologue. In Sophocles those entries are most carefully prepared which mark a turning-point in the play, just before or just after a crisis in the play; Teucer's messenger and Menelaus in the *Ajax*, Hyllus (when he returns from Euboea) and Heracles in the *Trachiniae*, Orestes and Aegisthus in the *Electra*, Neoptolemus when he comes back at the end of the *Philoctetes*, Creon and Polynices in the *Oedipus Coloneus*. Perhaps the Theban herdsman in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* is the best example; in the prologue we are told that one of the servants who were with Laius when he was murdered survives, and Oedipus states his intention of discovering Laius' murderer; in the first act Tiresias says that Oedipus will be shown to be the murderer of his father and the husband of his mother; in the second act Oedipus has the herdsman summoned; in the third act Oedipus summons him again; in the fourth act he is seen coming. In Euripides there is no entry so carefully prepared as this; the most careful preparation is made for the messenger's speech, and this is strictly not a preparation for the entry of the messenger but for the action off the stage

which is related by the messenger. Take the *Bacchae*: in the prologue Dionysus says that he will fight Pentheus, in the first act Tiresias says that Pentheus may bring woe to the house of Cadmus, in the second act Dionysus tells Pentheus that Dionysus will punish him for impiety, in the third act Dionysus says that Pentheus shall come where he shall pay the penalty of death, in the fourth act Pentheus says he will go and see the Maenads and Dionysus says that another shall bring him home, then after the chorus the messenger arrives. It is a different technique from that of Sophocles; it is not the arrival of the messenger which is prepared but the death of Pentheus, which the messenger will relate. Apart from messengers the distant preparations for entries in Euripides are usually weak preparations. Oedipus in the *Phoenissae* and the priestess in the *Ion* are typical. Oedipus has been named in most of the scenes in the *Phoenissae* but with no suggestion that he is likely to appear, then in the last scene he is summoned by Antigone. In the *Ion* the priestess is named in the prologue as having found the baby Ion, named in the next scene by Ion; two scenes later Ion says that he must discover his mother and hopes that she may be an Athenian, and from this we know that the priestess may have to appear to assist the identification; two scenes later the priestess does suddenly appear, and though we are not expecting her we know who she is. The preparation is there, but it is weak and does not direct the course of the play.

The conclusion is that Sophocles prepares his entries carefully, and the more carefully the more important they are for directing the action. Euripides often leaves important entries practically unprepared, but may prepare us for the action. This is a fundamental difference. The cause is too far for us to seek. I suggest that Sophocles thinks of action as in the control of human beings and Euripides thinks of action as in the control of chance. But we can see the technical consequences of this fundamental difference. Consider how the two poets use plots or devices which are hatched and worked out

before the eyes of the audience. Compare the plots in the *Electra* and *Philoctetes* with the plots in the *Electra*, *Helen*, *Iphigenia in Tauris*, *Orestes* and *Bacchae*. In Euripides the plot is hatched late in the play and carried out as soon as hatched.<sup>1</sup> In Sophocles the plot is used as the framework of the play; it is hatched in the prologue, and prepares us for all the entries and actions of one character or set of characters, until its object is achieved and this achievement ends the play. The plot in Aeschylus' *Choephoroe* is of the Euripidean type, the programme is made late in the play and then carried out in detail; this suggests that this is the older form. Just as in Aeschylus' *Supplices* character tells chorus what to do and then they do it, so in the *Choephoroe* character tells character and chorus what to do and then they do it; the careful lay-out of the speeches in the Io scene of the *Prometheus* and in the comparison of warriors of the *Septem* is an intermediate stage.<sup>2</sup> Sophocles took the old form and made it into a structural element of his tragedy. Euripides preserved it because he liked to construct his tragedy of self-contained parts and because it gave him an opportunity for realistic action on the stage. Euripides preserves the two-dimensional form of Aeschylus; if anything happens away from the scene of action, it happens during a chorus and is related by a messenger. Sophocles is striking out to a new three-dimensional form where what is happening off the stage effects and is effected by what is happening on the stage, and the whole action is under human control. Therefore the arrival of a Sophoclean character is expected, Euripidean characters arrive unexpectedly.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

<sup>1</sup> The *Antiope* seems to have had a similar plot: after Dirce and Antiope had left the stage, the shepherd told the twins that Antiope was their mother; they then plotted that the twins should free Antiope and the shepherd fetch Lycus to be murdered; the plot was then carried out.

<sup>2</sup> For the lay-out of Prometheus' speeches the concentric lay-out of Pindar's myths should be compared (Illig, *Zur Form der pindarischen Erzählung*).

## ΚΟΠΠΑΤΙΑΣ AND ΒΟΥΚΕΦΑΛΟΣ.

ARISTOPHANES' *CLOUDS* 23, 438;  
FR. 135.

WHY should a fine horse in the fifth century be branded with a *koppa*? The pun in *Clouds* 24 εἶθ' ἐξεκόπη πρότερον τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν λίθῳ does not help us. The association of κοππατίας with βουκέφαλος quoted from *Anagyros* (fr. 42; Dind. 135) only confirms that the *koppa* marked a particular breed of horse. The βουκέφαλος was Thessalian, and it has naturally been assumed that the κοππατίας was Corinthian. But what of the σαμφόρας in *Knights* 603, *Clouds* 122, 1298? Again it is an 'old letter' (L. and S. seventh edition) that has survived as a brand; as φ χ ψ survived as numerals in the western alphabets.<sup>1</sup> True, *koppa* survived on Corinthian coins, but it was in use in the Corinthian alphabet. Herodotus I. 139 says that Δωριεῖς μὲν σὰν καλέουσι, Ἴωνες δὲ σίγμα; and as we know the shapes of the sibilant letter in 'Dorian' and 'Ionian' alphabets (M and 4 or Σ), there is the further question whether what a Greek horse-dealer called *san* was a Greek letter at all, and not rather the Phoenician *shin*, W, which consists of the same combination of strokes for a sibilant letter.

At this point we must recur to βουκέφαλος. Whether any Thessalian horses looked like that, we cannot now tell. Certainly on Thessalian coins they have normal heads; and Alexander is not likely to have ridden a boöpid monster. But was βουκέφαλος descriptive of the animal, or of the mark it bore? The first letter of the Greek alphabet has its name from the 'ox,'

*aleph* in Phoenician, whose head it originally represented, and still resembles, ♀; though in more cursive use it has been set on one side—⚡. Among not very literate horse-breeders the best horses—classed 'ΑΙ,' as we say of ships—may well have been nicknamed βουκέφαλοι.

But there is another reason for looking outside Greek lands for the meaning of κοππατίας. On a metal bowl engraved in 'mixed oriental' style, of the sixth or seventh century, and found in a tomb at Caere (Grifi, *Mon. di Cere antica*, Pls. VIII, IX: Perrot-Chipiez, *Hist. de l'Art* III, figs. 549, 551) are represented horses, both ridden and driven, on whose hind-quarters is branded the Egyptian *ankh*-sign, ♀, or 'tau-cross.' The magical symbolism of the *ankh*-sign needs no illustration; and it is like enough to a Phoenician *koph*, Φ, or Corinthian *koppa*, Ϝ, to give rise to the nickname κοππατίας for a horse of some certified Egyptian or perhaps Libyan breed. Egyptian horses were of high repute at all periods of classical antiquity: two Libyan teams are in the list of competitors at Delphi in Sophocles' *Electra* 701 ff., presumably credible to a fifth-century audience; Herodotus IV. 189 thought Greek four-horse-racing a Libyan custom.<sup>2</sup>

JOHN L. MYRES.

New College, Oxford.

<sup>1</sup> For much curious learning about Libyan horses in relation to Greek, see Ridgeway, *The Origin and Influence of the Thoroughbred Horse* (Cambridge, 1905): where the suggestion is made (p. 296, n.) that the κοππατίας had a *koppa*-shaped 'star' or 'blaze' on its forehead like the 'Anazah' horses of Syria, and other more or less 'thoroughbred' strains; and that σαμφόρας 'also might mean some kind of blaze.'

<sup>2</sup> Eust. 785.

## BEDE AND VEGETIUS.

IN the useful Note on 'Bede and Vegetius' which he contributed to the *Classical Review* for last December (xlv. pp. 248 f.), Professor Jones states that 'Bede's debt to Vegetius has hitherto escaped notice.' This is true as regards three of the cases cited in the Note, but not as regards the fourth. As long ago as 1899 the late Dr. George Neilson pointed out in *The Antonine Wall Report* (p. 22) that the distinction drawn in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* between *muris* and *vallum* was couched in

language which was virtually identical with that used in the *Epitoma Rei Militaris*.

In mentioning this in my *Roman Wall in Scotland* (1911) I ventured to add a footnote to the effect that the identity did not necessarily imply direct borrowing but rather suggested a glossary. The idea of a glossary fits in very well with Professor Jones's second and third examples—the definition of *rheuma* and the reference to *monoxylae*. It is much less obviously suitable for the first.

GEORGE MACDONALD.

Edinburgh.



## REVIEWS

## AN ITALIAN ANTHOLOGY OF GREEK LYRIC POETS.

*Nuova Antologia dei Frammenti della Lirica greca.* Testi commentati di quattordici poeti, con profili e appendici critiche. BRUNO LAVAGNINI. Pp. xi + 297. Turin: Paravia, 1932. Paper, L. 43.

THIS book is almost the book for which we have all been waiting. It provides an admirable selection from the Greek elegiac and lyric poets, together with introductions to separate authors, explanatory notes below the text, and appendices on points of interest. It is, unfortunately, more or less useless to our University students because the rigours of our educational system prevent them from learning Italian. Also it is perhaps too selective for more advanced students. It remains, however, a charming collection of great pieces of poetry, edited with acumen, taste, knowledge, and a sound notion of what the reader requires.

The text is good throughout. More critical and cautious than Diehl, Lavagnini knows how to fill the gaps in papyri. His texts of Sappho and Alcaeus are admirably straightforward and have the authentic Lesbian ring. At times he is perhaps unwarrantably attached to tradition, as when he preserves *Ἀππ* in Sappho 2 (Diehl 54), but more often he is right where greater men have gone wrong. His text and explanation of Anacreon 5 (Diehl 5) is clearly final. On vexed questions, such as the existence of the digamma in Aeolic, Lavagnini keeps an open mind. Though he finds in editors from Diehl to Lobel 'un incomprensibile odio del digamma,' he is cautious in his insertion of it, and both in *Ἑλέγε* and *Ἑλέλαν* he has good evidence on his side.

The footnotes are exegetical mainly on points of language. The dialect forms are explained easily by the quotation of Attic parallels, and the gist of difficult passages, such as the end of Ibycus's poem to Polycrates or Alcman's *Partheneion*, is given in a simple analysis of the sense. It is a pity that, like most foreign writers, Lavagnini ignores Mr. Sheppard's brilliant article on the *Partheneion* and prefers Kukula's theory, which leaves the major difficulties unsolved. Nor will all his readers be convinced that Wilamowitz's arrangement of Simonides' poem to Scopas is necessarily the best.

The introductions are admirable. Lavagnini is used to good literature and treats the Greek poets with great fairness and insight. His literary criticism is apt and happily expressed. He also gives the main historical facts in a readable form. When the facts are disputed, he gives the reasons for his conclusion in an appendix, and then he reveals how much thought has gone to his seemingly effortless statements. His review of the Theognis problem will probably please neither Mr. Allen nor Professor Jacoby, but it contains much good sense and sound historical criticism. At times Lavagnini is carried beyond the limits of his subject, and it may be doubted whether Sappho's poetry really requires a discourse on psycho-analysis or a long quotation from the Comtesse de Noailles. But this book is primarily intended for the educated and intelligent reader, and we must not blame it if it occasionally strays into paths forbidden to the classical scholar. C. M. BOWRA.

Wadham College, Oxford.

## PINDAR IN ENGLISH VERSE.

*The Odes of Pindar rendered in English Verse.* By ALEXANDER FALCONER MURISON. Pp. xi+288. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1933. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

THE ideal translation should be cast in a literary form which does justice to the

original and reproduces its spirit, and should at the same time serve as a guide to the student who wishes to master the exact meaning of the author.

A prose translation of Pindar obviously cannot fulfil all these con-

ditions. It can and does, *e.g.* in Sir J. E. Sandys' translation, satisfy the needs of the student of the text; while Dr. Farnell's version in rhythmic prose-periods goes a step further in having some of the characteristics of verse.

If he chooses verse, the translator has the choice of a rhyming or of a free metrical form. The latter would appear most suitable as being the form used by Pindar himself; it has been used most successfully by Messrs. Wadegery and Bowra in their version of the *Pythians*, which succeeds in the seemingly impossible task of reproducing something of Pindar's grace and power.

Dr. Murison, following in the steps of Mr. Abraham Moore and Mr. Charles Billson, has chosen a rhymed verse. Such a form is open to the grave objection that it substitutes a series of short flights for the sustained eagle-swoop of the original.

Dr. Murison's version, though it occasionally provides a felicitous rendering, is on the whole quite unsuccessful. It is often intolerably prosaic, *e.g.*,

The fact was the reverse of what she said.  
A victory a local man did gain.  
'Tis only posthumous opinion  
That tells the conduct of departed men.

There are many instances of anticlimax, for example,

Yea, steeds in cars and ships upon the sea,  
O Queen, by gracious aid of thee,

In swiftly circling contests great  
Are wonderful to contemplate.

Many awkward inversions occur, for instance,

Whenever by the Graces' kindly will  
It happens that the tongue the rill  
From bottom of the heart forth leads.

Phrases are often inserted for which the original gives no warrant, for example, Ἥβαν τ' ὀπνύει is rendered,

Hath Hebe for his wife—the bonny bird.

and ἐκ Λυκίας δὲ Γλαῦκον ἐλθόντα τρώμεον Δαναοί becomes,

Now Glaukos, who from Lycia had come,  
Was dreaded by the Danaoi, *all and some*.

Archaisms, such as 'I weet' and 'with-outen,' are frequent and sometimes quite inapposite, for example,

The main thing is the moment right to ween.

Occasionally we find sheer nonsense, such as,

Who is the mortal wight begat this may?

In short, the version before us will not recommend itself to the student who wishes to get at the meaning of Pindar—we are nowhere ever told what text is being translated—and it will give the Greekless reader a very poor opinion of one of the greatest, perhaps the greatest, lyric poet of all time.

EDWARD S. FORSTER.

*University of Sheffield.*

#### MORE NEW CHAPTERS.

*New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature. Third Series. Some recent discoveries in Greek poetry and prose of the Classical and later periods.* Edited by J. U. POWELL. Pp. 268; 17 illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933. Cloth, 15s.

EIGHT years separated the second of these excellent volumes from the first, but we have had to wait only four for the third. Every reader will hope that at least a fourth will follow, and that Mr. Barber's name will again be seen on the title-page. In the present volume Mr. Bowra discusses Earlier Lyric and Elegiac Poetry, and also, at a later point, Erinna. Tragedy falls to Dr. Pickard-Cambridge, Comedy to Mr. Platnauer, Later Elegy, Epigram,

and Lyric Poetry to Mr. Powell, and the Novel to Mr. Rattenbury. An appendix by Professor Mountford deals with the Cairo Musical Fragment.

Except that Platnauer omits the Cairo Menander, all the contributors but Powell survey the whole field of twentieth-century discovery. Pickard-Cambridge, indeed, takes the 1889 Nauck as his starting-point, and includes the *Antiope*, and Rattenbury discusses the Ninos Romance. The book is crammed with detail, and only a few points can be mentioned here.

Bowra's article is admirably comprehensive and contains many quotations accompanied by valuable translations and comments. He usefully summarizes some of Lobel's important general-

izations. On a few points, for instance the *ἀντίμνα* passages on p. 12, he might perhaps have shown more reserve, but he seems to be right in accepting the spuriousness of the Hector-Andromache poem: some will regret its loss less than he does. In spite of the complexity of the material there are few slips, but one or two criticisms may be offered. On p. 14 his language might suggest that twenty-five new lines have been added to one of Alcaeus's most famous fragments, Bergk 18, instead of to the shorter Bergk 19. On p. 15 the plausibility of Wilamowitz's γάμψ hardly survives the removal of γαυθεῖς, and on p. 19 ἰλλάψ in the Castor poem should be ascribed to Wilamowitz and εὐσδύγων to Edmonds.

Pickard-Cambridge's article is most important, and no student should overlook his discussions of the Aexone inscription and of the new papyrus material. One sentence, in which the italics are mine, delightfully reveals his temperamental bias: he writes of the *Ichneutae*, on p. 94, 'there is happily nothing in the play which need revive the controversy as to the origins of satyric drama and tragedy, or which even throws light on the problem.'

Platnauer treats the whole field of

Comedy, with the exception already noted, in an interesting way. A few phrases are misleading: χοροῦ, for instance, in the text of Pap. Berol. 11771, does not in itself point more to the Middle Comedy than to the New (p. 167), nor is the prologue preserved in Pap. Argent. 53 important in quite the sense stated on p. 178. It is also wrong to write (p. 158). 'Three Oxyrhynchus papyri seem to contain Aristophanic scholia, but they are of doubtful attribution and little importance; another scholium is perhaps referable to the *Gerytades*,' with footnote references to Pap. Ox. xi and Pap. Flor. ii, without mentioning the undisputed *Acharnians* scholia in Pap. Ox. vi. But these are trivialities in a valuable chapter.

The last two sections are especially interesting, since they deal illuminatingly with comparatively unfamiliar material. Rattenbury's work, in particular, is a most important contribution to the history of Greek prose fiction. Taken as a whole, the volume provides an indispensable summary and bibliography of some of the chief categories of modern papyrus discovery.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

#### THE INTERPRETATION OF GREEK VASES.

*L'Ame hellénique d'après les Vases grecs.*

Par GEORGES MÉAUTIS. Pp. 189; 45 plates. Paris: 'L'Artisan du Livre,' 1932. Paper.

THIS book is beautifully produced; both printing and reproduction are above reproach. The first chapter deals with the 'emotive value' of Greek vases with a view to understanding the vase-painters' predilection for certain myths, the second with the composition of Greek vases as an index to the emotional life of the Greek soul, the third with the Eleusinian mysteries. The third chapter is based on the interpretation of a black-figured lekythos in Palermo with representations of the 'Danaides' and Oknos. I am not competent to discuss the *σῶμα-σῆμα* theory, its Orphic origin, its appearance in Herodotus, Heraclitus, Aristophanes, Plato, and the Eleusinian mysteries;

this is dangerous ground for any but the expert in ancient religion. In the first two chapters the interpretation of Greek vases is sympathetic and loving, and much may be learnt from this penetrating study about the mind of the artists and therefore of their *clientèle*. I add some detailed criticisms. P. 19 f.: the discussion of 'scenes of departure' is excellent, but the warrior does not *drink* the 'coup du départ'; he pours a libation. P. 59: in the Antaios Krater Euphronios carefully stresses the contrast between the trained Greek and the untrained giant, so that it would be right to speak of 'emotive value,' the value of discipline. P. 60: in the Geryon of Exekias it is true that 'les deux autres corps brandissent toujours la lance,' but there is an arrow in the eye of the further body. P. 64: 've siècle' is presumably a misprint for



'ivē.' P. 70: Douris' important experiments in perspective are still not appreciated. P. 75 f.: 'principe de dexteralité' (the victor should be on the right of the god) is an illusion; there are Greeks and Trojans on both sides of Athena at Aegina, Greeks and Centaurs on both sides of Apollo at Olympia. P. 97: 'les Grecs du milieu du v<sup>e</sup> siècle avaient le sentiment très net de l'unité et de la cohérence du type de culture du vi<sup>e</sup> et du début du v<sup>e</sup> siècle qui a inspiré l'art archaïque'; but there is all the difference in the world between the ideals of the

old education in the *Clouds*, which the author rightly connects with the Marathonachai, between the ideals of the generation of Pindar and Aeschylus and the ideals of the courts of Polycrates and the Pisistratids which are the ideals of archaic as distinct from early classical art. This failure to separate the art of the sixth century from the art of the early fifth century leads the author into difficulties again on pp. 148-9, p. 164.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

*University of Manchester.*

#### ANCIENT LAW-GIVING.

*Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen und althellenischen Gesetzgebung.* By MAX MÜHL. (*Klio*, Beiheft XXIX) Pp. 107. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1933. Paper, RM. 7.50 (bound, 9).

THOSE who have read Dr. Mühl's *Die antike Menschheitsidee* will welcome another book by him, and will not be disappointed; close-packed with matter and well documented, it is interesting and suggestive and a book to read, though it would need a jurist to review it properly. Its aim is to compare the earliest Greek laws with those of the East, the Hellenistic period being excluded, and to elucidate points of contact or likeness; the laws utilized are those of Zaleukos, Charondas, Draco, Solon, Gortyn and Sparta for Greece, and for Asia the codes of Hammurabi and the Hittites, the Hexateuch, and some Assyrian laws. Mühl goes through various provisions of criminal and civil law, and claims to have proved some eastern influence on Greece, chiefly Babylonian; among the items are the killing of an animal which has killed a man, the 'eye for eye' penalty of Zaleukos, two laws of Gortyn—on failure to return a pledge and on compensation to an adopted son if disowned—and the law of Charondas (the genuineness of which he defends) that all sales must be for cash, not credit. But in many cases he only draws out the parallel. The comparative humanity of Greek (and Hittite), as against Semitic, law comes out over and over again, though humanity was not the

motive reason; and there is a good section on Retaliation (Talion), which in Hittite law was, strangely enough, unknown. To the list of Hittite death-penalties, few in number, might be added the provision that it was death to marry your wife's sister; and I doubt the statement that only Hammurabi and Charondas allowed a woman to divorce her husband, for most scholars, I think, hold that in pre-Ptolemaic Egypt either spouse could divorce the other. Naturally the book raises many problems, and I cannot follow Mühl over the Twelve Tables. He cites from them three provisions which he thinks oriental: (a) the double penalty for theft, found in Hammurabi, *Exodus*, and Solon; (b) permission to kill a burglar by night but not by day, found in *Exodus* and a Greek law, probably Solon's; (c) the common Semitic penalty of 'limb for limb,' in Greek law found only in Zaleukos. He suggests, in good company, that the intermediary between Asia and Rome was Etruria. But whether the Etruscans *did* come from Asia is a highly contentious question; and anyhow in 454 B.C. Rome sent three commissioners to Greece to study the laws of Solon and other laws, including (in one source) those of Magna Graecia. That accounts for (a) and (b); but it is a problem why Rome should adopt Zaleukos' unique law. But, law apart, there was a very old feeling in Greece in favour of *δράσαντι παθεῖν* as a principle, which lasted on till Polybius anyhow; may not both

Zaleukos and the Twelve Tables independently reflect here something very ancient? The archaic death-penalty for theft, which occurs both in Hammurabi and in a Greek law (? Draco),

is treated by Mühl, *qua* Babylonian, as a fossil of an earlier day; may not this occasionally be true of Greece and Rome also?

W. W. TARN.

### OUT OF THE PAST.

*Caravan Cities.* By M. ROSTOVITZEFF. Translated by D. and T. Talbot Rice. Pp. xiv + 232; 35 plates, 6 figures in text, 5 maps and plans. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932. Cloth, 15s.

*Out of the Past of Greece and Rome.* By MICHAEL I. ROSTOVITZEFF. Pp. xvii + 129; frontispiece, and 28 illustrations in text. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, \$2.00 or 11s. 6d.

*Caravan Cities* is an attractive blend of the popular (in the best sense) and the scientific, and gives a new point of view. It is an account of caravan trade as practised round and across the Syrian and Arabian deserts, illustrated by descriptions of four cities—Petra, Jerash, Palmyra, Dura—which owed their wealth and importance to being on some caravan route; it comes at a good time, when the Foe is ousting the camel. Professor Rostovtzeff does everything that his great knowledge of the archaeology of the Nearer East can do to make the dry bones live. The ruins of the four cities are fully described, with some illuminating suggestions, as that the 'temple of Isis' at Petra is really that of the city's Fortune, and that Palmyra (as a great emporium) was deliberately created by Rome and Parthia as neutral ground between them. Parthia, its trade, and its art play a large part in the chapters on Palmyra and Dura; possibly the prominence given to Parthia (rightly, I venture to think) may seem to some almost the outstanding feature of the book. The author calls for more air-maps, to plot out the caravan routes; even since he wrote, air-photography has revealed a long stretch of one of the roads from Damascus. Much of the book is extremely picturesque, notably Petra, but some parts, like the account of Palmyra—the houses, the workshops, the merchants and their life and associa-

tions—are much better than picturesque; they are really constructive, and will come with a great sense of freshness to many readers. This applies particularly to Dura, where Rostovtzeff has himself been excavating; the reader feels that he is behind the scenes, for beside some account of two yet unpublished buildings—a temple of Artemis Azzanathkona and a shrine of Aphlad—the author has been able to give a page to the recent and sensational discovery of a Christian place of worship, of some period before 250 A.D., with paintings illustrating the Old and New Testaments, among them one of the Good Shepherd and another of the three Marys bringing myrrh to the tomb (see further in *C.R.A.C. Inscr.*, 1932, p. 314).

There is a good deal of history in the book, always interesting, but occasionally written with rather a flowing pen; it would have been the better of some revision, for though one can usually oneself discount too wide a statement, the general reader may not. The sentence on p. 25, that 'neither Alexander nor his followers could conquer Arabia' and that even today 'neither the English nor the French are able to subdue it'—which means that we have all tried and failed—seems an obvious mistranslation; but Greek sailors steering by the planet Venus (p. 44) has beaten me completely. On p. 28 Hipparchus is a misprint for Hippalus. There is a small selected bibliography, and many excellent plates; as two are devoted to camels, I wish one of the camels from Ashurbanipal's fight with the Arabs on the spirited frieze in the British Museum could have been included; they are better than anything before the Tang figures, and are not yet hackneyed.

For *Out of the Past*, which is a popular work, primarily for young people, I have nothing but praise. It comprises six essays—ancient life in South Russia,

the Olympic games, Pompeii, Messina (really Etna), Petra and Palmyra, Zeno and Apollonius, the first and the two last being based on Rostovtzeff's larger works. The essays are amazingly vivid and picturesque, and if Vesuvius does confront Etna across the Straits of Messina (p. 59), so be it; did not a

great poet make Tempe lie in Pelion's shadow? The book is not called a translation; but if written in English it is a very remarkable feat, and, though popular, there are few who can afford to forgo the pleasure of reading it.

W. W. TARN.

### THE DISCOVERY OF THE ANCIENT WORLD.

*The Discovery of the Ancient World.* By HARRY E. BURTON. Pp. 130; 4 maps, whole-page. Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, \$1.50.

In this concise, handy and compact book Professor Burton well achieves the object stated in his preface. He describes briefly, for the benefit of students and of the general reader, the gradual progress of geographical knowledge in ancient times, beginning with the Egyptians and ending with the geographical work of Ptolemy and the subsequent decline in activity and knowledge. For almost every statement that is made references are given in footnotes to the original sources; there are four maps, which delineate the world as known to Hecataeus, Herodotus, Strabo, and Ptolemy; there is a good bibliography, and an index.

The author rightly, in his 108 pages of narrative, omits many modern discussions and theories, and many an entertaining tale. The book has two drawbacks: (i) Much evidence from archaeological discoveries is omitted, important though it is; (ii) in his desire to be concise and to refrain from giving galleries of names, the author occasionally starves or slightly misleads the reader. The following are the more important points. (P. 4) The suggestion of land between western Europe and eastern Asia is earlier than Strabo, being part of Stoic ideas which were embodied in a globe by Crates of Mallos c. 150 B.C. They pictured an imaginary North 'America' and an imaginary South 'America' as separate continents. It might be noted also that the sphericity of the earth was taught by the Pythagoreans for metaphysic, not scientific, reasons. (Pp. 18,

21) Thrinacia, in Homer, being a small uninhabited island only producing certain holy flocks and herds, can hardly be Sicily or Italy. (Pp. 28, 31) 'Peri-odos' and 'periplus': the general reader needs a translation of these terms. (P. 33) Some believe that Hanno went far beyond Sherboro Sound. (P. 33) Further citations from Aeschylus (*Prometheus Bound*, *Seven against Thebes*, and *Suppliants*) would reveal, amongst other things, some absurd ideas of that poet. In 'Indian Ocean' Professor Burton of course includes the 'Arabian Sea' of today. (P. 41) It should be stated that Herodotus confuses the Persian *Royal Road* with another, which diverged in a great curve round the Anatolian Desert (Calder, in *Class. Rev.*, XXXIX, 1925, pp. 7-11). (P. 44) Note that it is in Theopompus (fr. 74, ed. Grenfell and Hunt) that we find the first notice of a separate Southern Continent or 'Terra Australis.' (P. 50) An example of undue brevity—the rivers Hydaspes, Hyphasis and Hesydrus are not given their modern names. 'No one in antiquity added anything to the knowledge of the Indus brought back by the followers of Alexander.' Doubtful; the details of Ptolemy's Geography seem to be results of later explorations. (P. 51) Alexander and circumnavigation of Arabia. This was partly carried out. The expedition sent from Egypt, as indicated by Theophrastus, landed in South Arabia and found incense-trees—an achievement which the Arabs never allowed a second time. About Patrocles, it should be mentioned that it was he who established the fixed belief that one could sail from India round eastern Asia into the Caspian. (P. 52) Add the elephant-hunts of the Ptolemies beyond Bab-el-Mandeb and the discovery of Cape



Guardafui and the southward turn there of Africa. (P. 55) The full title is *De mirabilibus auscultationibus* or *περὶ θαυμασιῶν ἀκουσμάτων*. (P. 59) Polybius: Pliny shows that he reached the Senegal. Agatharchides: to the sources given for Agatharchides should be added Diodorus, who worked into his third book the fifth book of Agatharchides' work *On the Trog(odytes* or *On the Erythraean Sea*. (P. 63) Doubtless Caesar confused Monapia (Isle of Man) with Mona (Anglesey). (P. 88) Though Pliny is the first to mention the *Nigris* (the Niger?), his authority is Juba of an earlier date. (Pp. 113 ff.) To the bibliography should be added:

A. Berthelot, *L'Asie ancienne centrale et sud-orientale d'après Ptolémée*, Payot, Paris, 1930: and Miss B. C. J. Timmer, *Megasthenes en de indische Maatschappij*, Amsterdam, 1930.

The following errors need correction: p. 68, foot: the note-number 1 is missing; p. 85, note 1: for *Mare* read *Maris*; p. 91 (and in index): Avelites should be Avalites; Manuthias (and in index) should be Menuthias; p. 94: Sessatae should be Sesatae or Besatae; pp. 116, 117: Detlefsen should be Detlefsen, and (p. 117, under Renou) Ptolémée should be Ptolémée.

These criticisms will in no way detract from the general usefulness of the book as a whole. The reader who has not so far studied the history of ancient geography can hardly help being stimulated to further reading when he has read this popularly written work; and that was precisely Professor Burton's object in writing it.

E. H. WARMINGTON.

King's College, London.

#### HISTORIOGRAPHY.

B. LAVAGNINI: *Saggio sulla storiografia greca*. Pp. 101. Bari: Laterza, 1933. Paper, 10 lire.

HUGH TAYLOR: *History as a Science*. Pp. 138. London: Methuen, 1933. Cloth, 7s. 6d. nett.

DR. LAVAGNINI, in a pleasantly and clearly written essay, gives a short account of Greek historians from Hecataeus and the first scientific enquirers to Dio Cassius, Arrian, and the earliest Byzantines. He rightly emphasizes the critical spirit of the early logographi, their interest in the present and in human affairs—the distinction between them and the later epic—and the fact that their enquiries were largely assisted by the union of Western Asia and Egypt under the Persians. But his chapters on Herodotus and Thucydides are oversimplified for these complex characters. It is inadequate and misleading to say of the former that he wrote his history of the wars from the Athenian point of view, and that 'pervade tutta l'opera il contrasto della civiltà ellenica colla civiltà orientale, del dispotismo barbarico colla libertà greca'; still more that for him 'la storia non è perciò giuoco di forze umane, ma campo all'attuazione di una legge divina,' and that the doctrine of a quiet and obscure life,

that death is the best thing for man, which Herodotus puts into the mouth of Solon and of Artabanus, gives us everything of his own outlook on life. What indeed has it to do with the Periclean Athenian under whose influence Herodotus is supposed to have written? Similarly, a quotation or two from the speeches (including the Melian dialogue) are enough for Dr. Lavagnini to prove that Thucydides shared the view that success is the only criterion of state action, and moral questions irrelevant; and that he inserted the speeches primarily to express his own analysis of a situation and his own views; which, if true, would considerably detract from the objective, scientific character of his narrative which the authoremphasizes. Nor is it Thucydides' 'rationalism' in religious matters (in the narrow, modern sense of the word) which makes his history more scientific than that of Herodotus; but his more critical attitude towards his sources, his immense care and accuracy, and his far greater understanding of politics and war. Dr. Lavagnini maintains that Thucydides had no successors; it is true that none of them was his peer, but he underestimates the contemporary importance of patient researchers like

the Atthidographi and historians such as Hieronymus, and overestimates that of the rhetorical school and still more of Duris, Phylarchus and writers of that stamp. The rhetorical historians were more important later, because men were then more interested in literature than in history, just as Macaulay will always occupy a larger space in English literature than Stubbs; which does not mean that we regard him as a better historian. In general, however, Dr. Lavagnini draws a clear picture of the progress of historiography after Thucydides, especially of the divorce, almost complete, between literature and history.

There is not much in Mr. Taylor's book which requires notice in this journal. The half of it is theoretical, the other half the application of the theory to certain subjects, as the history of war (the best chapter) and of revolution (the weakest). The theoretical half contains a number of assertions of the need for scientific method in history, the inductive method, and of the ill

effects of studying history with fixed preconceptions; all true enough, and there can be no harm in repeating them, though it is clear that the author has preconceptions of his own; but what is needed is not the repetition of a well-known truth, but examples of scientific history. In place of this, Mr. Taylor only gives us some of his own conclusions and inferences from his studies; and as all these take the emphatic form of 'If history teaches us one thing for certain, it is that,' or 'nothing can be clearer than that,' we must conclude that he is not himself doing what he rightly says a scientist should do, treat his inferences as hypotheses only, to be tested by further research, but regards them as universal truths, and of absolute validity. As I have very little sympathy with his inferences, I rejoice at this defect; but it detracts from the worth of his denunciation of other unscientific historians.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

#### GREEK HISTORICAL INSCRIPTIONS.

*A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions, to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* By M. N. TOD. Pp. xx + 256. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1933. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

THE title of this book and the name of its author are alone enough to ensure it a warm reception, especially among those who have long used (and are therefore most grateful to) the work of Hicks and Hill. This is a new book, though arranged on the same lines as the old: not only is the selection new, and all the texts thoroughly revised in the light of *I.G.*<sup>2</sup> and of the most recent work of the American group of epigraphists, of Wilhelm, and of Mr. Tod himself, but the historical commentary on well-known inscriptions is greatly improved; for instance, on the treaties with Chalcis and Erythrae, the Greek mercenaries of Psammetichus, the financial decree of Callias, the Parthenon building accounts, and many others. The Salamis inscription of the sixth century becomes almost a new document. It is all well done, very accurate, very concise, and clear; a

work of the highest scholarship. If therefore I make some criticism, this hardly lessens my admiration for the book.

First, a few details (very few). No. 36 (the Gortyn code), l. 41: '(the successful party) shall summon him,' etc. This should be '(the defeated party)'? No. 30 (the quota-lists), πόλεις αὐταὶ φόρον ταξάμεναι: Tod gives some support to the translation 'cities separately assessed' ('alone,' 'by themselves') 'as a punitive measure by a process of ἀπόταξις'; but the middle ταξάμεναι makes this impossible. He is not sufficiently emphatic that his explanation of the rubric πόλεις ἅς οἱ ἰδιῶται ἐνέγραψαν φόρον φέρειν (that the cities were not officially members of the league, but individual citizens, probably merchants who wished to enjoy the commercial benefits of membership, guaranteed payment of the tribute) must be right. No. 90 (Oeniades honoured at Athens 408/7 B.C.), 'the proposer of this decree may well be the same Diitrephes who . . . in 411 overthrew the Thasian

democracy': very unlikely that one who made so disastrous a mistake, in the interests of the oligarchy, should be prominent in the Athens of 408. The Selymbria inscription, ll. 13-17: 'only real property can be reclaimed by Athenians and their allies'; we need some explanation, how they came to be possessed of real property in Selymbria.

Second, for the script used. Tod adheres to the system of Hicks and Hill, refusing to write *o* for *ω* and *ou*, and *ε* for *η* and *ει*, yet keeping *ε'* *στήλην*, *στήλην*, *έχσηρημένα*, and the like, which I should have thought are equally 'offensive to the traditions of English education,' as Hicks and Hill put it. I cannot see the advantage of this illogical system; and one who begins his study of inscriptions with this book must learn a fresh one as soon as he looks at *I.G.*, or a facsimile. Another point: the method of indicating restored letters by square brackets has the disadvantage that in reading one often misses the brackets, and that the longer the restoration the more likely is one to miss them (a single letter being easily enough seen). The difficulty is aggravated in this volume, as, to save space, Tod prints the text continuously, and indicates the ends of lines on the stones, in the usual way, by a vertical dash, which can be confused with the bracket. Take an extreme example, No. 91, 'Athens honours Archelaus of Macedonia: 407-6 B.C.' (*I.G.* i<sup>2</sup> 105): it takes considerable trouble to see what letters are restored in ll. 3-4, *εργ* *αμμάτ* [*ευ*] *ε*, *Αντιγένης* *ήρχε*, *Σιβ* *ύρτιο* [*ς* *έ*] *πεσάτ* [*ει*], and in ll. 23-6, *κ* *αθά* [*περ* *εδ*] *οχσεν* *τῷ* *δήμῳ*. *Ἐπειδὴ δὲ Ἀρχέλαος καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν χρ* [*ν*] *ωι* *ἐσ* [*τιν* *ἀν*] *ήρ* *ἀγαθός* *περὶ Ἀθηναίων*. In fact both the date and the name of Archelaus are restored; restorations ingenious indeed, but anything but certain, as the story of previous attempts shows. It is difficult to suggest a better system of indicating them, and they are of course alluded to here in the commentary; but it increases the need of caution in restoring; restoration creates a prejudice if no facsimile is printed, and a feeling of confidence where none is justified, as

has been pointed out by Elter in a criticism of the *editio minor* of *I.G.*<sup>1</sup> In this particular case, the subject of the inscription is so doubtful that it might well have been omitted from this *Selection*; or better, we might have it printed in facsimile as well, and used to show the difficulties which beset the epigraphist and the methods used to solve them. The student could do with two or three examples of method.

Thirdly, Mr. Tod's selection. Thirteen inscriptions in *H.H.* have been omitted, including some we should have been glad to see again, for example 24 (Spartan inscription at the time of the Helot revolt), 39 (Thespians honoured at Athens), 55 (the dedication to Athena Hygieia: this one especially interesting because it can be compared with Plutarch's account, and throws light on his methods); twenty-six inscriptions have been added, which greatly increase the value of the book. Yet there are still some regrettable omissions: there are no *decreta demorum et trittyum*, no *termini*, and nothing from the Erechtheum building inscriptions. These would have been of particular value, for they illustrate the social and economic history of Athens, which is much more dependent on inscriptions than is political and military history: without them we have so little material. Mr. Tod gives some of the Parthenon building accounts, but they illustrate state finance rather than conditions of labour. The question of space is of course important; but space could have been found for these by cutting down that allotted to the quota-lists (of which Mr. Tod gives five), to the loans from the sacred treasuries, and to the *traditiones*. Of the quota-lists, for example (since we cannot have all the evidence), all we need is one complete, and extracts from others which give the different rubrics, together with Mr. Tod's admirable summary of the whole. Of the laws of Gortyn he gives only an extract; rightly, though in this case, in view of its interest and difficulty, we might well have had a longer one. It

<sup>1</sup> *Ein athenisches Gesetz über die eleusinische Aparche*, Bonn, diss. 1914, pp. 55-6.



is to be hoped that in the next volume he will give inscriptions of this type: from the Eleusis building inscriptions (invaluable in comparison with those of the Erechtheum), the manumission group, prytaneis and ephebic lists, the mining leases, and so forth; also that he will continue the series into the third century, at least to the end of the Chremonidean war, in sufficient numbers to enable the student to appreciate the kind of evidence used with such skill by Tarn, Ferguson and other scholars; also to help in weakening that strong but false idea that 323 B.C. marks an epoch in Greek history. A notable single absentee from this book

is *I.G. ii*<sup>2</sup> 1591, the Arginusae casualty-list: or does Mr. Tod not agree with this attribution?

Lastly, the price: twelve-and-sixpence for the sixth and fifth centuries, and presumably another twelve-and-six for the second volume. The book is primarily intended for university students, and admirably suited to them; but how many can afford this? The large majority will be precluded from using it, and will have to be content with their Lietzmann. It seems to be a self-stultifying policy.

A. W. GOMME.

*University of Glasgow.*

### THE BUDÉ HERODOTUS.

*Hérodote: Introduction.* Par PH.-E. LEGRAND. Pp. 246. 20 fr. *Hérodote: Histoires.* Livre I. Texte établi et traduit par PH.-E. LEGRAND. Pp. 206. 30 fr. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1932. Paper, 20 and 30 fr.

PROFESSOR LEGRAND's first two volumes—a generous *Introduction*, and Book I—speak well for the success of his intended complete edition of Herodotus. In its first section, the *Introduction* discusses (i) (pp. 5-37) H.'s life. Briefly, the view taken is that H., probably partly Greek, partly Carian, and not of 'noble' stock, was born at Halicarnassus c. 485-490 (with Diels, Professor Legrand rejects A. Gellius' date as conjecture). His share (not leadership) in overthrowing Lygdamis brought exile at Samos: returning, H. went to Thurii in 443, there making his home until his death, perhaps as late as c. 420. (References in *Ar. Birds* accepted as showing recent publication, not H. still living: passages in *Acharnians* rejected.) H.'s visit to Athens (perhaps 447-444) is important: he is, though not blindly, pro-Athenian—'tout imprégné, tout pénétré de l'esprit d'Athènes': he did not return (Thucydides in II. 8 is mistaken: H. did not hear of the second earthquake): Eusebius' story of H.'s reward by the Athenians—referred to inaccurately by Plutarch—is accepted. (ii) (pp. 37-178) Character of H. and his work. A detailed discussion with

copious references. H.'s human interest, especially in individuals, marks him out on the historical side: he is no plagiarist, merely an innocent borrower: his good faith is vindicated, but he shows carelessness: not a profound politician, philosopher or psychologist: displays certain moral pessimism which his religious beliefs do nothing to improve: in short, not a 'savant'—nor even a student—but an intelligent, educated 'man of the world' of his day, favourably circumstanced. He wrote, mostly, as he (and his informants) spoke. Clearly, much of this is controversial, and the inevitable debt to previous scholars is freely admitted. But it may be commended as a sound, up-to-date study. It covers a wide field, and though concise is always most attractive in presentation.

The second section (pp. 179 to end) deals with the MSS. and establishment of text. The Florentine group is regarded as superior, and the value of papyrus-evidence is duly emphasized. The possibility of overcoming the dialect-confusion of the MSS. is doubted—any modern edition must be somewhat arbitrary. The partial unification suggested may be considered in connection with Book I, where (e.g.) *ev* is retained in preference to *eo* or *eov* after *ι, η, ο, οι*: elsewhere rejected. In *eo* verbs, forms *ee, eei*, after *η, ι*, and *υ* (but not *οι*) are contracted: after a consonant, usually

uncontracted: but uncontracted subjunctive forms *ην, ηται*, are retained. (*ποιέω* is an exception.) Accusative forms *εα* and *ις* in 1st Decl. Masc. Sing. and 3rd Decl. Plural respectively are retained. Excepting these and other points of morphology, the text is mainly that of Stein and Hude, supported by a reasonably full *apparatus criticus*. The Prooimion reads *Θουρίου* (Halicarnassians caused substitution). Elsewhere, suggestions are mostly slight, but the following deserve attention: οὐδέ τι Πελασγικόν (58): *κατάλεξασθαι* (59. 5: cf. 98. 2): *ἐκ θ. ἐνεκτῆσαντο πόλιν* (165. 1): *ἐλαίφ, ἀλειφαρ ἐκ τ. σ. ποιεύντες* (193. 4: cf. II. 87, 94): *οἱ δ' αὖ χρήματα* (196. 2), *τὸ δὲ ὦν χρυσίον* (196. 3).

The translation has been proved readable and accurate, but the accompanying notes vary considerably in merit, and their revision would often have allowed improved paging of the translation. An excellent preface (sources, etc.) precedes each section of the text. A few errors have been noted in the *Introduction*, and in Book I, among others, the following: 82, l. 31, *τέλους* (for *-ος*): 146, l. 14, *ὁμοσιπῆσα* (for *-σαι*): omission in 131, l. 3, and 185, ll. 27-8, of *καί* and *πολλὰς* respectively. Punctuation needs correction in 170, l. 11, and on p. 50, in *ἀφ. cr.*, for 31 read 32.

G. CLEMENT WHITTICK.

*Armstrong College,  
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*

### PREHISTORIC ELEUSIS.

Προϊστορικὴ Ἐλευσίς. By Γεώργιος Ἐ. Μυλωνάς. Pp. viii+184; 2 plans and 128 figures in the text. Ἀθήναι: Ἀρχαιολογικὸν Τμήμα Ἐπουργείου Παιδείας, 1932. Paper.

IT had been known, since the excavations of Dr. Skias some thirty years ago, that Eleusis was an important Bronze Age site; and those familiar with its museum have often wished for a comprehensive publication of the pottery and other prehistoric finds. The happy resumption of the excavations has enabled Dr. Kourouniotes to invite Dr. Mylonas, who has already made a name for himself as a prehistorian, to take special charge of the prehistoric side. Dr. Mylonas has continued the work of Dr. Skias on the south slope of the acropolis hill with valuable results. He shows, for instance, that this area was an inhabited site from Middle Helladic times and that the pyres which Dr. Skias thought he had discovered were really, as had long been suspected, the remains of burnt and destroyed dwellings. The Middle Helladic tombs found among the houses, and by Dr. Kourouniotes deep below the foundations of the Stoa of Philo, are a useful addition to knowledge and are excellently described and illustrated. The prompt publication of this and other new material and the republication of the old,

which has been carefully revised, in this convenient form deserves our hearty thanks, and the author's straightforward and systematic report might well serve as a model for others. It is all the more welcome because the good work carried out, often under great difficulties, by the Greek Archaeological Service does not always receive the recognition it should.

The book begins with a brief introduction, with which is coupled a description of the stratification of the site. Architecture follows, first with the buildings of the Middle and Late Helladic periods, none, unfortunately, complete, though the best preserved is a L.H. I house, and secondly with the tombs, also both Middle and Late Helladic. The next and largest section describes and discusses the pottery, which the author groups categorically according to the system of Early, Middle, and Late Helladic now generally adopted by excavators on the mainland of Greece. The Early Helladic period is only scantily represented, but the Middle and Late periods are illustrated by a long series containing several important pieces of the usual classes. There is least of Late Helladic III. In this section both methodical classification and pertinent observation are well displayed. After a short

section on the smaller finds, among which pieces of worked boar's tusks, perhaps from a helmet, from a Middle Helladic tomb should be noticed, the book closes with two short sections, a sober discussion of the general results and of chronology. The type and illustrations are clear and the photographs of the vases all show a scale.

There is little to criticize, though one might suggest that vase No. 394 in Figure 112 is more probably L.H. I or II than L.H. III. Dr. Mylonas' latest excavations in 1932 promise further discoveries of equal importance, and one can wish nothing better than that his publication of them will be up to this standard.

A. J. B. WACE.

### GREEK COINS.

*Greek Coins.* A history of metallic currency and coinage down to the fall of the Hellenistic kingdoms. By CHARLES SELTMAN. Pp. xix + 311; 9 figures, 4 maps, 64 plates. London: Methuen, 1933. Cloth, 25s.

MR. SELTMAN'S book on Greek Coins has long been awaited with eager expectation and will now be welcomed with open arms. Despite all that we owe to Head's *Historia Numorum* or to Gardner's *History of Greek Coinage*, we have long been feeling the need of a new survey of the field that shall take account of the latest detailed research and that shall present Greek coinage, visible as a whole, in its relation to ancient history, religion, and art alike. Mr. Seltman has naturally not set himself the impossible task of saying all or nearly all that might be said about Greek coinage within a compass of just over 300 pages. But he has faced a difficult task with fine resolution and judgement, and has found a treatment that preserves unity in a mass of diversity. By following in the main the thread of history he has shown Greek coinage as a single phenomenon in the life of ancient civilization, and has found opportunity to illumine by the way many points of interest and difficulty in art and religion. The book is well equipped with bibliography, index and key to plates. The sixty-four plates—a magnificent allowance—are uniformly good, and the additional illustrations in the text are very helpful to the argument. We feel confident that Mr. Seltman's book will soon make and long keep its own place in our numismatic library.

It is impossible in a short review to do justice to the wealth of interest in the book or to enter into its more po-

lemic passages. There is a very interesting—necessarily rather speculative—first chapter on early currency prior to the coin proper. There is an excellent discussion of the introduction of coinage by Lydians or Greeks: an early date—c. 700 B.C., or even before—is quite rightly assigned. Early Athens provides a fascinating chapter, based largely on Mr. Seltman's own earlier researches: even if some details may have to be ultimately corrected, it is already a fine document of the results that can be obtained by close study of coins backed by knowledge of archaeology and history. To the historian, the stories of the Ionian Revolt, of the first Athenian Empire, and of the Theban challenge to Sparta, as shown on coins, will be of fascinating interest. In the West, the marvellous series of Syracuse is handled with confident skill. A new attribution of tetradrachms, hitherto assigned to early Agathocles, to a period some decades earlier seems to have everything in its favour (pp. 189, 190). In accordance with the trend of all modern research, the immense importance of Philip and Alexander is fully recognized: the exposition of the Alexander coinage, based on Mr. E. T. Newell's brilliant researches, is masterly. Treating of art, Mr. Seltman declines to overdo appreciation and allows his illustrations to speak for themselves: but this does not of course exclude the occasional word of judicious comment, as for example on the great artists of Aetna, Catana and Naxos (p. 132), or on the marvellous portraiture of the Bactrian kings (p. 434). Occasionally, a judgement, like that passed on p. 195 on the 'sentimentality' of the Tarantine gold stater, showing



Taras appealing to Poseidon, may provoke a protest from some: but the book is none the worse for that.

Of all the ways of approach to the amazing world of Greece, the path of coins is one of the best—not the easiest

ascent, but one that leads surely to the very heart of the citadel. On this path of happy adventure Mr. Seltman's book will be a sure and delightful guide.

H. MATTINGLY.

*British Museum.*

#### AN ITALIAN EDITION OF ISOCRATES' PANEGYRICUS.

*Isocrate: Il Panegirico.* By PIERO TREVES. Pp. xxvii+162. Turin: Paravia, 1932. Paper, 10.50 lire.

THIS edition is, within its limits, a very competent piece of work. The Greek text is that of Blass. The rather full commentary aims primarily at explaining grammatical and syntactic usages as well as peculiarities of diction. As is to be expected in a book intended for school use, some of the notes are elementary; still, older students will occasionally find interpretations and comments worthy of careful consideration. The historical annotations, however, are often all too brief. This deficiency is made partially good by the introduction of twenty-two pages in which a short account of Isocrates' life is followed by a clear and sane picture of the historical background to the *Panegyricus*. In it special emphasis is rightly placed on the far-reaching consequences of the King's Peace, and on the extensive and effective use made of Greek legends by the orator in many of his discourses.

A few criticisms of detail may here be given. Why does the editor harp (pp. vii, xv, xviii) on the poverty of Isocrates' father, who, on the contrary, seems to have been a man of moderate substance? There are no grounds for saying (p. viii) that Gorgias was continuously in Athens after 427 B.C. At least we know that he spent his declin-

ing years in Thessaly. It is misleading to write (p. xvii) that Isocrates 'diresse una scuola di psicagogia, com' è il termine greco e platonico.' The editor quotes no authority, but presumably this generalization rests on the description in two places (*Phaedrus* 261A, 271C) of rhetoric as a kind of *ψυχagogia*. In the note on *αὐτοχθονία* (§ 24) we miss a reference to the important passage in *De Pace* § 49. It would have been more helpful to his young readers if the editor, instead of merely saying (p. 95) that cleruchies were a feature of the fifth century, had mentioned the oldest Athenian cleruchy, Chalcis, the date of whose foundation at the very time, 506 B.C., when noteworthy constitutional and political reforms were taking place at Athens, can hardly be a mere coincidence. In § 113 Isocrates writes of the political victims of Sparta in 404-3 B.C. We cannot see why Signor Treves should say that modern readers will here think at once of Socrates. The philosopher's condemnation occurred in 399 and was the result of a strong democratic reaction at Athens. The dates of the 'Social' War are wrongly given (p. 139) as 355-53. The only misprints that we have noted are *πώποτε* in two places (pp. 72 and 139).

M. L. W. LAISTNER.

*Cornell University.*

#### AGAPE AND EROS.

*Agape and Eros: A Study of the Christian Idea of Love.* Part I. By ANDERS NYGREN. Authorized translation by A. G. HEBERT. London: S.P.C.K., 1932. Cloth, 6s.

THIS book, written by a Swedish professor of theology and translated by one of the Kelham fathers, comes into a

category which is, perhaps, less thickly populated for the classical scholar than for the theologian; it is not only a work of scholarship and exegesis, but also one which has a living and practical interest as bearing on the foundations of belief and conduct. True, its author would seem to wish to shut off

this latter portion of its concern, as tending to obscure the reader's judgement upon the evidence which is being presented: he knows how much stronger our hearts are than our heads, how much more powerful tradition is than philosophy. And yet, at the same time, we must remember that for Plato, at any rate, philosophy was a way of life and of salvation; and indeed the two things with which Dr Nygren is concerned in this book are just two ways of salvation, whose nature and method it is his business to examine. The lucidity of his work is remarkable: going back beyond the obscurity of their accretions and syntheses, he traces to their first clear formulations the two methods of *agape* and *eros*, the one in Plato, the other in the New Testament. He is probably the first person in later times to set the two side by side in such clear contrast (though others including Nietzsche and Wilamowitz have not been silent), for, on his own showing, they have, almost from the earliest days of Christianity, been to some extent merged and modified. *Eros*, then, as portrayed by Plato, is desire for something, desire to have, to possess something, for oneself, for ever. *Eros* is the creature, half god, half man, which bears man up from earth and enables him to attain to the things divine. The passage of this heavenly *Eros* is always upward; it passes from that which is transitory, unsatisfying, towards that which is eternal, the perfect object of its striving. In Aristotle this *eros* becomes more extensive, more inclusive, universal. For him, it embraces not only the human soul but the whole of nature: it is manifested in the potentiality of matter in its lowest condition and at all its successive stages, while at the summit stands the unmoved mover, who *κινεῖ ὡς ἐρώμενον*; the object of the world's desire, towards which all is continually striving—*et merito*, because this is the only object of ultimate value, worthy and able to be its τέλος. Over against this is the *agape* of the Christian gospel, displayed in the Crucifix, the God on the cross, correctly described by St. Paul as a stumbling-block to the Greeks; for what beauty has he that we should

desire him, or we, that he should desire us? The great Greek belief that it is the object which determines the quality of the faculties directed to it—knowledge apprehends the real, opinion the apparent, heavenly *eros* desires the good and the beautiful, and so on—is here flatly contradicted. *Agape* is independent of the goodness of its object: God's *agape* is directed towards the sinner, the Christian's towards his enemy. When *agape* comes down, it does not (as *eros* does) thereby fall. The object need not first have value in itself; *agape* creates value in it. So it looks as if, after all, Plato was no Christian before Christ, and *Eros* must be numbered with Apollo, Ashtaroth and Moloch among the damned crew, for does he not intrude, climb, fly into the fold? But if so, then the long series of mystics have done the same; and indeed Dr Nygren seems to be well aware of this. Though they understood all mysteries and all knowledge (*γνώσις*), they may not have had *agape*. In the end, the whole question turns upon what place self is to have in the scheme of things, and Dr Nygren plainly describes *agape*-religion as theocentric and *eros*-religion as egocentric. And here he seems to be entirely justified. *Eros* is directed to a worthy object because of the benefit which will accrue to itself therefrom; *agape* is directed to unworthy objects without any thought for its own advantage. Illustrations of the effects resulting from these two attitudes could be supplied in abundance; an instance from the classics of a position founded on *eros* is the sort of discussion one finds in Plato and Aristotle on friendship—a typical strain of the *eros*-theme in ordinary life. And of course there is the tendency in Plato to disregard particular things, or to use them chiefly as means to an end. Beautiful bodies lead us on to beautiful souls, and beautiful souls to αὐτὸ τὸ καλόν. The very reason why Plato loves them not is because they die; *eros*, the heavenly *eros*, must not rest upon that which passes away. And now that Dr Nygren has distinguished so clearly these two, *agape* and *eros*, the problem is, how to put them together again, that is, supposing that they can be permanently

reconciled at all. Dr Nygren seems to think that they cannot, and he may be right. If so, the practical man who has to make a choice will have to reject one of them, and the choice is not easy. Can we reject *eros* as being, on this showing, no better than Pride, the deadliest of the Seven Sins? Can we not use some of its activity to supplement the comparative passivity of *πίστις*, which according to St. Paul is

the proper attitude of response to *agape*? It is the old controversy between faith and works. Dr Nygren and his translator deserve our sincere gratitude for having presented us with so clear a definition of the terms in the problem; perhaps in the second volume they will either give us the answer to the problem or else show us that we have not yet stated it correctly. A. L. PECK.

*Christ's College, Cambridge.*

### THE LOEB EDITION OF THE *POLITICS*.

*Aristotle: The Politics*. With an English translation. By H. RACKHAM. Pp. xxiii + 684. London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam), 1932. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.)

THE text of the *Politics*, resting as it does on MSS. which with one exception belong to the fourteenth or a later century, and on one mediaeval translation, with no help from ancient commentators, is in a poor state, and calls for emendation more than most of Aristotle's genuine works. Luckily many scholars have worked at it, and have in many cases been able to restore what Aristotle must have written. Mr. Rackham has taken full account both of the MS. readings and of the emendations. In accordance with the plan of the Loeb series he makes no attempt at a full *apparatus criticus*; but he records many of the most important MS. variations, and a fairly full selection of the more probable emendations, many of which will not be found in Newman or in Immisch; and for this readers will be grateful. Further, though in many passages there is still room for difference of opinion, most readers will agree that he has shown good judgment in the choice of emendations for admission to the text. He has introduced some thirty-five emendations of his own; of these about half are convincing and should appear in any future edition, viz. those in 1265<sup>b</sup>21,<sup>1</sup> 1286<sup>a</sup>29, 1289<sup>a</sup>2, 1291<sup>a</sup>39, 1292<sup>b</sup>4, 6, 1303<sup>b</sup>36, 1305<sup>a</sup>32, <sup>b</sup>28, 1311<sup>b</sup>37, 1312<sup>b</sup>14, 1315<sup>b</sup>22, 1330<sup>b</sup>26, 1331<sup>a</sup>4,

1341<sup>b</sup>19; and to these I would add οὐδ' εἰ ἔσται in 1316<sup>a</sup>26, which is suggested in a note. The emendations of his own introduced into the text in 1254<sup>a</sup>9, 1255<sup>b</sup>5, 1261<sup>a</sup>27-30, 1265<sup>a</sup>31, 1278<sup>a</sup>14, 1279<sup>b</sup>32, 1288<sup>a</sup>10, 12, 1291<sup>a</sup>41, 1292<sup>a</sup>18, 1294<sup>a</sup>28, 1315<sup>a</sup>13, 1322<sup>a</sup>25, <sup>b</sup>15 (very ingenious), 1323<sup>a</sup>34, 1327<sup>a</sup>26, <sup>b</sup>16, though they do not impose themselves with the same certainty, have a good deal of probability, and the same is true of a number of readings suggested in notes, viz. at 1252<sup>b</sup>29, 1254<sup>a</sup>8, 1260<sup>a</sup>3, 1282<sup>b</sup>25, 1283<sup>a</sup>32, <sup>b</sup>28, 1298<sup>a</sup>2, 1311<sup>a</sup>27, 1327<sup>a</sup>34. In 1252<sup>b</sup>17, 1253<sup>a</sup>8 <sup>b</sup>25, 1261<sup>a</sup>30, 1264<sup>a</sup>27, 1275<sup>a</sup>29, 1282<sup>b</sup>26, 1290<sup>a</sup>18, 1292<sup>b</sup>31, 1297<sup>b</sup>4, 1301<sup>b</sup>1, 1308<sup>b</sup>11, 1318<sup>a</sup>8, 1338<sup>b</sup>34, the changes proposed or adopted appear unnecessary. In 1294<sup>a</sup>15 the reading required by the translation is τοῦτο τὸ (not τοῦτο) τῆς πολιτείας εἶδος. In 1297<sup>b</sup>3 the proposed addition of δεῖν seems definitely wrong, εἰπεῖν being used in the sense of 'bid.' In 1313<sup>a</sup>5 the alteration of ἐκούσιον to ἐκουσίων is forbidden by Aristotle's usage of ἐκούσιος (never with a personal noun) and by 1285<sup>b</sup>5. Misprints have caught my eye in the text of 1258<sup>a</sup>18, 1261<sup>a</sup>28, 1294<sup>a</sup>12, and in p. 576 nn. 4, 5. The reading ἀπολογίαν adopted in 1281<sup>a</sup>41 seems to be forbidden by 1282<sup>b</sup>22. But in spite of a few slips of this kind, I think one may say with confidence that by virtue of its close following of the argument and its respect for grammar the text is an improvement on all previous texts, and takes us nearer to what we shall never get, a definitive text of the *Politics*.

The translation, while it occasionally lacks the neatness of Jowett's style, is

<sup>1</sup> It is to be regretted that the format of the Loeb series makes it impossible for texts in it to follow Bekker's lineation. My references are to the latter.



very much nearer to the Greek, and succeeds in being this without becoming awkward. Just occasionally it seems not quite to fit the text: e.g. in 1255 <sup>6</sup> it requires ἐν ᾧ, not ἐν ᾧ: in 1288 <sup>18</sup> it requires οὐθέν, not μηθέν: in 1289 <sup>10</sup> ἔχει, not ἔχει: in 1299 <sup>13</sup> ὅλας, not πῶλας: in 1306 <sup>2</sup> αὐτοῖς, not αὐτοῦς.

The introduction, notes, and indexes are short but useful; and the book as a whole may be very heartily welcomed as a valuable contribution to the understanding of Aristotle.

W. D. Ross.

Oriel College, Oxford.

## TWO BOOKS ON PLAUTUS.

*Plautinisches und Attisches.* Von GÜNTHER JACHMANN (Problemata, Heft 3). Pp. 258. Berlin: Weidmann, 1931. Paper, M. 16.

*The Economy of Actors in Plautus.* By CARRIE MAY KURRELMAYER. Pp. 103. (Doctoral thesis, Johns Hopkins University). Graz: Deutsche Vereins-Druckerei, 1932. Paper.

A DISCIPLE of Leo and Fränkel, Jachmann uses their methods to a rather different end. In his attempt to strip off the 'curling stucco-work' of Plautine accretions and reveal the Attic columns underneath, slender, straight and graceful, he takes as his basic principle the high technical excellence of the *νέα κωμῳδία*. In the Greek play speech and action form an organic whole; no detail is inserted merely for its own sake; elements of unreality there are, but the inconceivabilities of the Latin plays are to be laid to the account of the Latin playwright.

The intricate and cautious argument yields striking results. The *Rudens* becomes almost a new play for us after reading Jachmann's penetrating study. The two monologues of Daemones which begin at ll. 892 and 1190 respectively were composed by Plautus, not for some immediate farcical effect, but in the one case to introduce the new theme of Daedalis' jealousy, in the other to avoid inflicting on the Roman audience a second sentimental *ἀναγνώρισις*, this time between Daemones and Plesidippus. Here, in fact, Plautus works with an independence and power of invention and control of plot on a large scale such as he nowhere else displays.

The perplexing behaviour of Trachalio with regard to Gripus and the *cistula* is put in a different light by

pp. 56 ff. In contrast to the *Rudens* (and to the usual view) the *Casina* follows the Greek closely except in Plautus' characteristic omission of the 'happy ending.' That the broadest passage in Latin comedy derives from an Atellan or other sub-literary source is a view which—with regrets on more than one score—we must abandon; the 'Attic excellence' is not one of morals. Another play which reproduces faithfully its original is the *Aulularia*; here Jachmann's fine study of Euclio convincingly refutes Leo's view. Euclio is in truth the miser, a figure of Shakespearian stature, whose presence makes this play Menander's masterpiece. The traditional interpretation of *contaminare*—'to spoil by mixing together'—is upheld. Examples on a large scale are the *Miles* and the *Poenulus*. The *Epidicus* follows its model closely except, as Dziatzko saw, at the end, where Plautus shrank from revolting Roman feeling by a marriage between half-brother and half-sister. With especial interest we note that as a consequence he felt compelled to omit the wedding of the elderly couple as well; are we then to suspect Plautus of taste? The consideration of the *Trinummus* leads to an interesting appreciation of Philemon, and to a suggestion that Plautine research may some day be in a position to trace a development in technique from play to play. The chapter on the *Hautontimorumenos* reminds us that Terence too could play the blacksmith on occasion.

We hope we have given some idea of the importance of this work. There are those who will criticize matters of detail, or even the main principle of the Attic perfection of technique. Here



we would call in question one statement only. On p. 228 we are told that the ten (or eleven) plays the authors of whose originals we can—with more or less confidence—name include all the plays of high merit; that none of the 'anonymous' pieces even approximates to the *Mostellaria*. And so the *Asinaria* finds itself for a moment in the company of the blessed, a privilege denied to that obscure work the *Captivi*.

The second essay is a convenient summary of the facts relevant to a very vital feature of stage technique, and a valuable reminder of the care which the Latin dramatist bestowed on at least this practical matter. During the lifetime of Plautus the actor's profession, though (as we have recently begun to realize) it carried with it no stigma, at the same time had little to offer whether of honour or of emoluments; nor were there in 190 B.C. more than about eight days in the year during which plays could be produced. Consequently we must suppose that the available supply of trained actors was small, while *contaminatio* and the *cantica* raised special difficulties for the Roman producer. He solved them, after a fashion, by doubling or trebling the rôles, by occasionally substituting supers when a character had little or nothing to say, and even by omitting whole scenes. 'Unmotivated early exits' or 'late arrivals' are frequently

a device for giving the actor time to change his garb, and appear in more than one rôle. Dr Kurrelmeyer provides a most useful chart of each play from this point of view.

Here students have as it were a foot-rule with which to check their speculations. Our attitude, for instance, to the disappointing character of a meeting between lovers who, separately, were quite voluble, is at any rate modified by our discovery that the same actor was playing each rôle. The frequent undramatic monologues or dialogues assume a new guise when we realize that they are designed to give some actor time to change his costume. Plautus seems to have managed with five actors at most (usually fewer) and some supers.

Dr Kurrelmeyer has worked out her argument with care, though misprints and peculiarities of diction occasionally distract our attention. On the relation of the Latin play to the original she is practically silent; if, for example, the 'undramatic monologues' are entirely Plautine in origin, then Plautus is responsible for an unexpected proportion of the good things in the plays. Who can forget Euclio's account of how he killed his cock, *furum manifestarium*? Here is a subject deserving of further study.

W. BEARE.

University of Bristol.

#### AN ITALIAN ON SALLUST.

E. CESAREO: *Sallustio*. Pp. iv + 173. Florence: Le Monnier, 1932. Paper, Lire 5.

MR. CESAREO, who is known already as an active student of Sallust, now offers a general appreciation of his author—a brief book falling into two chapters, (i) *La vita e i tempi* and (ii) *L'opera*, which here means the *Bella* and nothing more. On his design, at least, he is to be congratulated. The first chapter attempts, in modern style, to portray Sallust in the setting of his age and to study in detail his attitude to the men and movements of the day. The attempt is laudable: indeed it deserves perhaps greater success than it has achieved.

To re-create the experience of the past, besides helping sales, is a higher task than the mere piling-up of uncoordinated facts. But it is a task which can legitimately be essayed only by those who have first made themselves masters of the evidence; and it is to be feared that in this work there are signs that the necessary preliminaries have, to say the least, been hurried. Charity may hold it trifling that in a single sentence (p. 8) Mr. Cesareo puts the birth of his hero both in 87 B.C. and in the seventh consulship of Marius; that he speaks of the *s.c. de re publica defendenda* in seriously misleading terms (p. 103); that he repeatedly describes the *populares* as democrats

(e.g. pp. 15 and 97); that he gives what many would regard as a topsy-turvy account of the relations between Pompeius and the Senate in 52 B.C. and the following years (pp. 53 and 62); that he calls 'questori' (p. 58) the magistrates said to have removed Sallust from the Senate in 50 B.C.; that he accepts without criticism the story that Sallust married the discarded Terentia (p. 70); or that his remarks on the form 'parvum' are by no means judicious (p. 142). Nor need the reader greatly complain that the case of the elder Africanus is not adduced as a parallel to the statements made about Marius in *B.J.* 92, 2 (p. 161), or that the invaluable testimony of Asconius (p. 43 ff.—Clark) for the events of *pr. Kal. Mart.* in 52 B.C., and the day after, has not been adequately used.

There is, however, a less venial fault—the blurred and sketchy treatment of the monographs themselves. A word or two about the *Bellum Catilinae* will be enough by way of illustration. After criticizing the theory of Schwartz as exaggerated (p. 34, n. 2), Mr. Cesareo nevertheless goes on to say, in dealing with c. 49, that Sallust 'vuole e deve difendere Cesare dalle accuse di com-

plicità nella congiura' (p. 45); and yet again, towards the end, he concludes that 'nè il *Catilina* nè la *Giugurtina* sono opere "a tesi"' (p. 155). Thus it is not surprising that we find no serious attempt to determine the occasion of the work—to decide whether it was provoked by the *de consiliis*, or by the general interest in the career of Julius stirred up by his assassination, or by some other cause: nor, in his remarks on p. 113 f. and p. 166, does the author seem to appreciate the problem presented by the chapter (54) wherein one interpretation would find the clue to the whole composition—the chapter which compares Caesar, in respect of morals, with the moral paragon of the age.

Yet, though scholars are not likely to learn a great deal from this book despite some original suggestions which it contains, the work may still be welcomed. It is a lively introduction to its subject; and its appearance is one more piece of evidence for the great and growing interest in Ancient Rome which prevails among the reading public in Italy to-day.

HUGH LAST.

*St. John's College, Oxford.*

#### ROSTAGNI'S VIRGILIO MINORE.

*Virgilio Minore: Saggio sullo svolgimento della poesia Virgilliana.* By AUGUSTO ROSTAGNI. Pp. viii+390. Turin: Chiantore, 1933. Paper, L. 46.

DESCRIBING the literary and circumstantial influences exerted on Virgil up to 38 B.C. and authenticating, dating, and interpreting the *Appendix*-pieces severally with an eye to the developing ideology exhibited, Rostagni brings to his task much industry, a resourceful mind, and a pleasantly forcible style; whilst clear and decisive statement renders almost a luxury the 10-page index added to a book already rather unduly swollen by polemical footnotes. As to authenticity-problems, it is refreshing to have the 'philologists'—those, that is, who decide such matters by metre, language, 'style,' source-tracking, and so on—for once so roughly handled. Rostagni stands firm on the

Suetonian tradition. At the crucial point, he dates *Culex* and *Ciris* at 48, emending *cum esset annorum XVI* to *c. e. a. XXI*, and argues that *Ciris* was, unlike *Culex*, worked over and given to Messalla not until 45; thus at once explaining the very striking differences between the two 'neoteric' pieces, accounting for *uenerande puer* and *iuuenum doctissime* addressed to two young gentlemen of equal age, and still not rejecting Suetonian authority ascribing both poems to the same year.—But, were Suetonius aware of the full facts concerning the composition of *Ciris*, would he not hand down 45 as the true date?—Consistently, *Copa* and *Moretum* are banished, and *Aetna* not admitted; and the less important pieces find their places readily enough, at the small expense of distributing the *Catalepton* over a rather wide area. Some of the dis-

cussions seem, perhaps, either too long or too short (e.g., that on testimony to the authenticity of *Culex*). Why, too, is *Aetna* given a full chapter, but *Dirae* almost as neglected as *Moretum*? But, on the whole, the scanty material available to the literary biographer is used effectively. As to interpretations—which, in general, appear somewhat generous to the poet and suffer little from the pardonable ubiquity of the authenticity-question—Rostagni may expect often to carry his readers some distance with him; but scarcely so in the case of *Culex*, when he half invites them to regard the winged insect and the serpent as symbolizing soul and grave—gratuitously weakening his main position. However, granting most of the interpretations, it is surprising how little Virgil can be shown to be influenced by his environment. He seems the pupil of his fellow poets, not of his masters in rhetoric and philosophy or the Cisalpines' hero Julius or the schools of civil war. Rostagni, indeed, instead of going out boldly for Catullan, Lucretian, Alexandrine, Sicilian 'periods,' would emphasize the influence of Neapolitan Siro's doctrine. But who will believe that regard for semi-orthodox Epicurean atomism helped to shape *Ciris*, with its miraculous lock of hair, double metamorphosis, and four motivating deities? Or agree that the idyllic world of the *Eclogues* owes something of its fashioning to the ideal

ethical world of the Garden? Easier, maybe, to seek in Epicurean determinism the starting-point for Virgil's final philosophic phase. But Rostagni finds the characteristic notes struck early and consistently in the *Appendix*. Few, probably, will be prepared to recognize even a rudimentary Virgilian Fatalism in the trite sentiment of the Pompeian (if Pompeian) epitaph; fewer, to discern the *lacrimae rerum* in a sympathetic treatment of the heroine of *Ciris* only to be avoided at the price of rendering the dramatic sketch odious to its audience. But Rostagni can point fairly to *Culex*, earlier and better authenticated. And so, really, he comes (perilously, for the biographical interest of his book) close to the conception of a poet patiently defending his spiritual integrity against external assaults, while, as patiently, accumulating the power for his self-expression in *Georgics* and *Aeneid*. There he is on surer ground, wherever he touches the specific Virgilian quality; and his suggestive approaches towards a characteristically definite analysis of that quality make the reviewer regret that much of the space occupied by biographical matter was not rather devoted to an account of Virgil's progress towards a technical mastery of his craft—in fulfilment of the apparent promise of the sub-title. After all, at the present stage of *Appendix*-criticism, is not that the obvious way of settling the authenticity-question?

D. L. DREW.

#### DOUBLE PRINCIPATE.

*Doppelprinzipat und Reichsteilung im Imperium Romanum.* By ERNST KORNEMANN. Pp. vi + 210. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1930. Cloth, RM. 10 (unbound, 8).

ANY book of Kornemann's is sure to be worth reading, and the theory that is worked out here will need earnest consideration. A brief introduction leads to the main thesis: Augustus was truly the creator of a dyarchy, not between Princeps and Senate—for according to K. the Mommsenian view of the Principate has been overthrown by Schulz and Dessau—but rather 'eine Zweiherrschaft vermittels doppelter Besetzung

der obersten Stelle, d.h. Doppelprinzipat.' With this clue K. conducts the reader through the history of the Julio-Claudian dynasty, finding at various points a double principate and a double succession; instances of the first are Augustus and Agrippa from 18 to 12 B.C. and Augustus and Tiberius from 6 B.C. onwards, instances of the second are Marcellus and Tiberius from 25 to 23, Gaius and Lucius Caesar from 17 B.C. to A.D. 2, and Germanicus and Drusus in Augustus' later years. Tiberius, with his devotion to Augustus' instructions, naturally adheres to this principle; after Germanicus' death he



takes his own son Drusus as partner, with Nero and Drusus (the two elder sons of Germanicus) as twin successors, and later still Gaius (Caligula) and Tiberius Gemellus. Claudius takes his wife Agrippina as partner in power (K. sees in the bestowal of the title Augusta on Livia and Agrippina a deliberate claim to political power), with Nero and Britannicus as twin successors, and Nero has his mother as partner for his first year or so. The Flavians follow the principle of Augustus, but after them the principle disappears for some forty years, cropping up again at the close of Hadrian's reign, and coming into its own under Marcus Aurelius, while with Caracalla and Geta the idea of a division of the Empire into European and Asiatic halves finds its first definite expression. K. traces the exits and entrances of his principle through the complex schemes of Diocletian, through Constantine and his successors, and on to 480; a final section shows it at work in Byzantium. The book concludes with some statistics and a general summary, wherein K. reiterates his belief that Augustus was the creator of a *Doppelprinzipat* and Marcus Aurelius next in importance after him, and that with the idea of a double principate there is bound up also a division of the realm (*Reichsteilung*). There is an appendix of some coin-types and a good index.

It will be seen that the book makes suggestions that, if true, are of very great importance. But though the present reviewer acknowledges gratefully the profit he has derived from its reading, he cannot assent to the main thesis. No one would deny that Marcus Aurelius did make a division of ruling, 'tuncque primum Romanum imperium duos Augustos habere coepit,' that under Caracalla and Geta a territorial division is also contemplated, and that Diocletian systematizes the whole business of division of power and territory and of the succession. But does this really go back in its origin to Augustus? K. insists that it does; throughout we hear of 'die Idee des Augustus,' of 'das von Augustus geschaffene Vieraugensystem,' and moreover K. declares that in elaborating such

a system Augustus showed a reprehensible blindness to the lessons of history.

Now by taking the passages that K. selects, and by leaving out of account others which he neglects, such an interpretation of Augustus' activities becomes possible, though even so it seems to the present reviewer a mistaken one and out of harmony with Augustus' mind and character. *Doppelprinzipat* carries with it, as K. declares, *Reichsteilung*. Is it conceivable that the man whose victory at Actium had brought the Mediterranean world under unity of rule would shortly afterwards have recreated, by such a division of power, the very danger he had suppressed? Had he learnt nothing from the struggle between Caesar and Pompey, between Antony and himself? K. thinks not, but he can muster no strong evidence, and evidence should be strong indeed to prove such a case. Ancient opinion seems to have looked upon the principate of Augustus as being the conferment of power upon one pre-eminent man; this man might and did take helpers to himself—'subsidia dominationi'—but not equal partners. On one occasion, it is true, a possible partition of duties is mentioned, when Tiberius after the death of Augustus appeared hesitant to accept the Principate, 'solam divi Augusti mentem tantae molis capacem . . . plures facilius munia rei publicae sociatis laboribus exsecuturos' (Tacitus *Ann.* I, 11). But the purpose of this declaration becomes obvious as we read on; it was not only necessary that the choice of Tiberius as Princeps should appear free, but the Senate must be convinced of the indivisibility of the Principate, ' . . . unum esse rei publicae corpus atque unius animo regendum.'

And what of the *Doppelnachfolge*? Here it seems to the reviewer that much of what K. turns into system can be more naturally explained by the well-known ἀσφάλεια of Augustus, and by his experimenting with possibilities in the new and untried medium of the Principate. In all his activities Augustus likes to make sureness doubly sure by having two or more strings to his bow: in legislation, baffled once, he will return patiently to the same object



by different means and different laws; in warfare he relies on the co-operation of two or more converging forces, as in Sicily or Spain. So too with the Principate: whatever his personal feelings about the succession, he knew well that what was essential for the state was that there should be more than one man with the necessary experience and power who could carry on, for a single heir is a dangerous thing. Hence a plurality of all possible successors, 'quo pluribus munimentis insisteret,' but that is not the same thing as a *Doppel-nachfolge*.

By his will Augustus ordered Livia to bear the name Augusta, and henceforward she appears as Julia Augusta: in this K. discovers one of the worst misfires of all Augustus' statecraft and a piece of perfidy—no less—towards Tiberius. This is indeed a strange judgment, outdoing Tacitus at his most malignant. There certainly exists evidence for the many honours conferred on or proposed for Livia; she was privileged above all other Roman women, she doubtless thought of herself as senior to her son, but where is there authentic or trustworthy testimony for her exercising power equal to his, or indeed any power at all? K. would presumably reply 'In Suetonius *Tib.* 50, Tacitus *Ann.* IV, 57, and Dio LVII, 12,' but the mere reading of those passages reveals clearly what is the bias and the tendency of the sources there utilized. Willrich, whom K. quotes in support of his view, certainly notes the bestowal of the title Augusta on Livia as remarkable, but rejects any political meaning, justly adding, 'aber auch der Antonia ist nach Livias Tode von Caligula der Augustatitel verliehen worden, ohne dass damit die Absicht verbunden gewesen wäre, ihr eine politische Rolle zuzuweisen.'

So much for the *Zweiherrschaft* of Tiberius and Livia: as regards the succession it is curious that, though no allusion is made to it in the main text, Germanicus appears on p. 185 as one of the victims ('Todesopfer' is the term employed) of the system; does K. really believe that Tiberius caused his death through Piso and Plancina or was an accomplice after the fact?

Germanicus out of the way, Tiberius, according to K., intended to take his son Drusus as partner, and hence the bestowal of *tribunicia potestas*. Possibly so, but there is at least equal possibility in the suggestion put forward by Barbagallo that in the years 21 and 22 Tiberius was meditating a tripartition of duties between himself, Sejanus and Drusus, the last of whom would be responsible for the defence of the frontiers.

In the years after A.D. 50 K., taking Dessau 220 as his text, discovers 'zwei Herrscher' (Claudius and Agrippina) and 'zwei Caesares' (Nero and Britannicus). But what is the evidence? Exceptional privileges and distinctions certainly, appearance at public functions beside her husband, bodyguard and so on, but by what definite enactment was power or *imperium* conferred upon her? There is no trace of any such. When Tacitus narrates how Agrippina wanted to sit beside her son to receive an Armenian embassy, he immediately adds how, thanks to the advice of Seneca and Burrus, such a scandal was avoided. She possessed influence in plenty, but of official authority nothing. The wife of a princeps, in the Roman constitution, no more held official power than the wife of a consul; Romans doubtless viewed the efforts of Agrippina with the same distrust as Englishmen of the 'fifties viewed the growing influence of the husband of Queen Victoria in matters of state. But to speak of 'zwei Herrscher' is a misuse of terms.

Similarly with the Flavians; it is possible to interpret the evidence as K. does, but it is also possible to regard Vespasian as a man determined that his sons and no one else should follow him, and therefore out to make it clear that only they were in a position to succeed him when the time came. But space does not allow, and the attempt is not necessary, for the foundation of K.'s thesis is that Augustus was the originator of the *Doppelprinzip* and that subsequent emperors followed, developed and modified this principle, and to the present reviewer the foundation does not seem well and truly laid. K. has simply not proved his first thesis. But

that does not mean that the book is without value; it is full of information and erudition and of interesting suggestions. Excellent, for instance, is the way in which he shows how the early simple principate of an Augustus was being developed into something like the pomp and ceremony of a court under Claudius and Nero, interesting too the hint that he throws out in a footnote on p. 19 as to the history and importance of the phrase 'si merebuntur'; to the instances there quoted

might well be added the Neronian 'cum meruero' (Suetonius *Nero*, 10). His book is provocative in the best sense of the word, and it will compel the reader to examine and weigh very seriously all sorts of traditional and accepted views and valuations about the early Principate.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

*St. John's College, Cambridge.*

NOTE.—The reviewer is not to blame for the lateness of this notice.—*Edd.*

### SPEECH AND LANGUAGE.

*The Theory of Speech and Language.*

By ALAN H. GARDINER, F.B.A.

Pp. x+332. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

THE unsatisfactoriness of most treatises on the theory of language has long been felt by students. Many of them have been scholarly and stimulating, but in spite of much brilliant work the impression they leave on the reader's mind is one of dissatisfaction. In some cases this is due to the fact that they have been too subjective and general, while others have been too narrow in their scope and treatment and have dealt with interesting but relatively incoordinated facts of a few languages rather than with language itself. Professor Gardiner in his preface modestly states that he is merely a novice in this study, but he is to be congratulated both on his width of reading and on the critical judgment and penetrating thought he has brought to it. In this book he approaches the question of language from a fresh standpoint. The problem he propounds is, What is language and how does speech work? His method is to put back single acts of speech into their original setting of real life and thence to discover what processes are employed and what factors involved. He rightly complains that most writers on this subject have failed to draw any distinction between speech and language; and yet this distinction is a vital one. Speech is individual utterance, possessing, however, a definitely co-operative character, for it is a

social phenomenon. It is always concerned with things, with the realities both of the external world and of man's inner experience, and it is always in the present. The unit of speech is the sentence, the most important characteristic of which is its purposiveness. Behind speech lies a whole body of previous knowledge, which we call language and of which the unit is the word. This leads Professor Gardiner to a discussion of the nature of the word and of 'meaning,' which he carefully distinguishes from 'thing meant.' By an elaborate analysis of an actual utterance he demonstrates that it requires a speaker, a listener, a 'thing meant,' and the words uttered. His insistence upon the necessity for a listener in a complete act of speech is, in spite of the opposition of many distinguished philologists, perfectly sound. Other factors which demand consideration are the situation, that is the circumstances in which the utterance is made, and the 'depth of intention' on the part of the speaker. Language is a universally possessed science the application of which is Speech, a universally exerted activity having at first definitely utilitarian aims. The insistence with which Professor Gardiner emphasizes this distinction and the clearness with which he expresses it are among the most important contributions of this book. He also discusses interestingly and suggestively form and function in language, sentence form, subject and predicate, types of sentence, and so on, of which

one cannot here make further mention. He proposes to continue the study in a second volume, and one need only say that it is to be hoped he will soon find

the leisure to carry on this excellent work.

P. S. NOBLE.

University of Leeds.

### THE ANCIENTS IN THE MODERNS.

(1) *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry*. By DOUGLAS BUSH. Pp. viii+360. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, \$4 or 24s.

(2) *Classical Mythology in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser*. By HENRY GIBBONS LOTSPEICH. Pp. x+126. Princeton: University Press, 1932. Paper, 12s.

THE present reviewer, having once perpetrated a handbook of mythology, has often toyed with the idea of writing a work on classical mythology in English literature, but recoiled before the immense amount of research which it would entail. Before any such book is completed, by anyone anywhere, there is room for many preliminary or partial studies such as these are in their different ways.

Professor Bush, who occupies the chair of English at the University of Minnesota, is a sad example of the havoc wrought by the dangerous heresiarch, Professor Livingstone Lowes. That most pestilential work, *The Road to Xanadu*, has infected many of the author's countrymen with the belief that so respectable an occupation as source-hunting may be pursued for no higher motive than sheer joy of it, and that the resultant treatise need not be unreadable or even dull. Hence two most necessary features are totally lacking in the work of the misguided Professor Bush; the reviewer has failed to find any tables of statistics, and has perused a number of pages without yawning once. Furthermore, there is reason to believe that Professor Bush has not contented himself with listing a mass of books written by Englishmen between about 1475 and 1680, but has dipped into, even read, these works, and that too because he found them interesting and amusing.

Seriously, it is to be regretted that the limitations of this periodical forbid such a book being dealt with as fully as

it deserves. The Classical Association is not pedantic in defining its title, but can hardly be supposed officially to specialize on the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; hence I must content myself with noting the excellent sketch the author gives of the change which came over classical tradition during the Middle Ages, the allowance which he makes for the media through which Elizabethan poets saw the ancients, and an admirable bit of scholarly imagination (p. 277) in which he pictures Milton asking himself how this and that situation in *Paradise Lost* should be handled, to find a classical answer every time, except for those episodes which he handles least well, and pass over very much else which makes this book a thing to return to for hints and interpretations, not for dry bones of fact.

Still, bones are necessary for flesh and skin to grow upon, and Mr. Lotspeich has constructed an excellent skeleton of knowledge; at least, the reviewer, after hunting a while for mistakes, has found none of any consequence.<sup>1</sup> His little work is a doctoral dissertation presented at Princeton and published as No. 9 of that University's *Studies in English*. It consists of a short bibliography (in which it is good to see Hyginus quoted in van Staveren's edition, not Schmidt's), a few pages of introduction explaining very well how Spenser used myth, and then a sort of dictionary of all the allusions and references in his poems, with brief indications, not only of the classical sources from which the stories ultimately come,

<sup>1</sup> Trifles are, on p. viii, *Poeticum Astronomicum* for *Poetica Astronomica* (the Greek gen. plur. in van Staveren's running title has been misinterpreted), and on p. 52, 'Sp. is following oral tradition' in misnaming Damon's friend Pythias. He would find it so spelled in his Valerius Maximus; see F. C. Le Comte, *Historia Damonis et Phintiae* (dissert., Leiden, 1847), p. 31, for particulars.



but of the passages in intermediate authors, notably Boccaccio and Natalis Comes, which have demonstrably or probably been drawn upon.

Here, then, are two men who recognize that English literature begins with

Homer, not Beowulf, and that two of its most important authors are Vergil and Ovid. It is to be hoped that both will write again.

H. J. ROSE.

*University of St. Andrews.*

*Sappho: Ihr Ruf und Ruhm bei der Nachwelt.*

By HORST RÜDIGER. Pp. 203. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1933. Paper, M. 6.60 (bound, 7.80).

THE theme of this book is the influence of Sappho upon German literature. 'Influence' is an elastic term and so is 'literature.' To quote from the preface: 'Um ein möglichst umfassendes Bild der Rezeption, des Einflusses und der Wirkung zu geben, wird der Begriff "Literatur" so weit gefasst, dass nicht nur schöngeistige Werke, sondern auch wissenschaftliche Schriften darunter verstanden werden, da die Wandlungen des Sapphobildes in der Dichtung nicht ohne die Kritik der Philologie verständlich wären.' We are given a concise survey of ancient opinions, which treats rather the history of the Sappho-legend than literary influences, and also a brief mention of German mediaeval references, before we come to the section on the Renaissance, where Italian and German humanists are considered side by side, Steinhöwel with Boccaccio. There follows a comprehensive survey of Sapphic scholarship from the Renaissance onwards, of early editions, and of first penetrations both of the legend and of poetic influence into Germany. The two biographical problems, those relating to tribadism and Phaon, are painstakingly but non-committally pursued throughout. There is a very interesting little note on the literary progeny of Sappho's γλυκύπικρον. Thus scrutinizing poets and scholars in turn the book marches slowly and solidly century by century to the present day. The sections on Grillparzer and his followers and on Rilke deserve special mention. It is perhaps surprising that Kleist is considered at such length while Geibel is dismissed with a few lines. Of editors and translators Gunther (1783), Degen (1787), Friedrich (1797), and Jaeger (1852) are not considered. Of modern works E. Lobel's *Σαπφούς μέλη* and D. M. Robinson's *Sappho* might have been noted.

R. W. MOORE.

*The Schools, Shrewsbury.*

*Daedalus and Thespis: The Contributions of the Ancient Dramatic Poets to our Knowledge of the Arts and Crafts of Greece.* By WALTER MILLER. Vol. II: Sculpture. Pp. xv+331-597 (continuous with paging of Vol. I); 45 plates. University of Missouri, Columbia, 1931. 2½ dollars.

THIS volume, issued in two unbound parts, is to be followed by a third. Its faults and merits are much the same as those of the first volume, noticed in *C.R.* XLIII, p. 218. About 400 pages deal with sculpture in the strict sense, the rest with every kind of wood and metal

work, including musical instruments, shoe-buckles, and even girdles of chastity, which Miller believes himself to have discovered in the *Agamemnon*. The book is diffuse and unscholarly, but the collection of passages is extraordinarily comprehensive, and valuable despite much irrelevance. The elaborate classification, into well over a hundred sections, makes it easy to use. The plates are mostly of familiar objects, but include a few not readily accessible. This volume, unlike the first, forms part of *The University of Missouri Studies* (Vol. VI, Numbers 3 and 4), and the editorial note states that the format has been changed to conform with that of the volume already published: in fact however these paper-covered parts are nearly half an inch shorter than the cloth-bound first volume.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

*Trinity College, Cambridge.*

EDOARDO ZELLER: *La Filosofia dei Greci nel suo Sviluppo storico.* Parte I: I Presocratici. Traduzione a cura di RODOLFO MONDOLFO. Vol. I. Pp. xv+425. Florence: 'La Nuova Italia,' 1932. Paper, 26 lire.

THIS first volume (covering the introductory chapters) of an Italian translation of Zeller's *Presocratics* appears in a series with the general title of 'Il Pensiero Storico.' The text followed is that of the fifth edition, the last issued in Zeller's lifetime; the translator explains fully and cogently his reasons for preferring this edition, with its personal quality and its 'classica integrità,' to the sixth and seventh, which contain additions (inserted in the text itself) by Lortzing and Nestle. Many of the contributions of these editors are here quoted in the footnotes.

While the translation as such is thoroughly competent and readable, the interest and the value of this volume, for non-Italian students, lie in the supplementary matter contributed by the translator himself. This is throughout clearly and scrupulously distinguished by square brackets in the footnotes, small type in the excursions of greater length, and the initial 'M.' appended. Besides many shorter comments to illustrate or amplify the main text, Professor Mondolfo gives 'notes' which run to the proportions of treatises on the following topics: relations between Greek and Oriental thought; relations between Greek religion and philosophy; Pherecydes; the Orphic cosmology and ancient theogonies; the Greek genius (this is a particularly stimulating essay); and the periods of Greek philosophy. There are, further, a number of bibliographical notes referring to more recent work on the various parts of the subject. These lists are not ex-



haustive, though in several instances very full and almost up to date; but the way in which the matter is classified under sub-topics makes them a valuable aid to further work on any point.

The book is well printed, and the ingenious differentiation of types in the index adds considerably to its usefulness. By a curious mistake the author of *The Religious Teachers of Greece* appears (p. 104) as 'A. James,' and similarly under 'James' in the index, whereas another entry refers correctly to 'Adam, J.' as quoted on p. 84. Other references tested at random have proved correct. This volume is to be welcomed as an important contribution to the study of the origins of Greek thought.

D. TARRANT.

Bedford College, London.

*Metaphysik der Sitten.* Lichtstrahlen des Platonischen Protagoras. WILHELM SCHNEIDER. Pp. 32. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1933. Paper, RM. 1.60.

THIS short study of the *Protagoras* is designed to make the dialogue more attractive and intelligible to the general reader by working out its philosophical implications. The author rejects the view that the main interest of the work lies in 'scenery' and dramatic characterization. His own treatment gains some liveliness by making Socrates the spokesman throughout. He concentrates on the discussion with Protagoras, which he briefly summarizes (in sections rather misleadingly called 'chapters'), giving also a reconstruction and translation of the ode of Simonides. He upholds the identification of the good with the pleasant by emphasizing the reference of all judgments of either to 'knowledge of the art of weighing and measuring.' The analysis of courage as a kind of knowledge is also worked out in detail. The term 'metaphysic' in the title is defended by reference to the 'being and unity' of virtue; but the values suggested are clearly those of logic rather than of ontology.

D. TARRANT.

Bedford College, London.

*The New Testament Concept of Metanoia.* By ALOYS H. DIRKSEN. Pp. xi+256. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1932. Paper.

THE aim of this dissertation is to vindicate the Catholic doctrine by which *μετάνοια* is a 'conversion' involving as essential elements confession and penance, against the Protestant view which reduces it to 'repentance.' Nearly half the book is given to a review of theological study on this question, leading to the conclusion that *poenitentia* in the ecclesiastical sense has been from earliest times and continuously a part of Catholic tradition. The author then goes back to examine the Jewish and Greek background of New Testament thought. He proves to his satisfaction that the elements of confession and penitential atonement are essential to Old Testament and later Judaic thought about repentance. In a brief survey of classical Greek literature he finds that both *μετάνοια* and *μετανοεῖν* tend to carry an emotional as well as an intellectual meaning. The section dealing

with Hellenistic writers contains some interesting matter; the *μῆλας* of Cebes is discussed in detail, and also the place of *πῶτος* in Stoicism. The author's conclusion is that in the first century A.D. *μετάνοια* definitely implies a process of 'conversion,' followed by some penitential action, in contrast to *μεταμέλεια* which is merely 'regret.' This interpretation is finally applied to the New Testament passages where the word is used. There are copious references throughout, and a long bibliography; the book is indeed a monument of industry. 'We may regard the *Metanoia* problem as solved' is the author's concluding statement; he has not spared evidence, nor yet words, to that end. *Quaerit sua dogmata quisque.*

D. TARRANT.

Bedford College, London.

*I Frammenti degli Stoici antichi*, vol. i: *Zenone*. By NICOLA FESTA. (Filosofi antichi e medievali: collana di testi e di traduzioni.) Pp. viii+128. Bari: Laterza, 1932. Paper, L. 15.

THIS Italian translation of the fragments of Zeno has two original features. First, where a number of sources report one opinion in slightly different forms we are given a contaminated version. This is a good but dangerous plan, and the translation of Dio L. VII. 40, *δεῖτερον δὲ τὸ φυσικὸν καὶ τρίτον τὸ ἠθικόν*, by 'poi l'etica, in fine la fisica' (to accommodate it to Sextus VII. 22) might well have been accompanied by a note. The second innovation is that an attempt is made to assign the fragments to the books from which they came. This is necessarily a speculative proceeding and little seems to be gained by it. The notes, which are not on the scale of Pearson's, serve their purpose without bringing much new. The emendation of SVF I. 262, *εἰς δὲ βίος ἡ <ὥς> καὶ κόσμος*, deserves mention.

F. H. SANDBACH.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

*Demostene e la Libertà greca.* By PIERO TREVES. Pp. xi+202. Bari: Laterza, 1933. Paper, L. 14.

IT is refreshing to read an essay on Demosthenes which is not a thinly disguised pamphlet on modern politicians. The author of this book is interested in his subject for its own sake. He knows the evidence through and through, though he does not parade his knowledge, and the notes appended to each chapter consist mainly of references to modern historians of the period. (He has made much more use of English writers than is usual with Italian scholars.) The book is very readable and even brilliant in style; it is only in the last chapter that it shows any tendency to rhetoric. Its principal object is to disprove the assumption common, as the author believes, to most earlier historians, and particularly to those of the nineteenth century, that after Chaeronea Athens and Demosthenes were 'down and out,' whereas in his own belief their resolution to stand for liberty to the last was as strong as ever, and it was not until after the Lamian War that the

cause was lost. It was perhaps as well to lay stress upon the spirit animating the Athenians and Demosthenes during this period, which in many books (though by no means in all) is treated as merely an appendix to the struggle with Philip. But the real value of this essay lies in its lucid explanation of the motives animating all parties from the Peace of Philocrates onwards, and in the clear-cut characterization of persons for which the author has a fine gift, even though one may sometimes wonder whether motives were ever so unmixed or characters so sharply defined. Be that as it may, his pictures of Isocrates, Philip, Attalus, Olympias, Alexander and Demosthenes himself are vivid and real, and his study has the value not only of a useful piece of historical criticism, but of a work of art.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

University of Sheffield.

*Zum Corpus Hippiatricorum Graecorum, Beiträge zur antiken Tierheilkunde* (Inaugural-Dissertation) = Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1932, Filosofi, Språkvetenskap och Historiska Vetenskaper, 5. By GUDMUND BJÖRCK. Pp. 91. Uppsala: Lundequist, 1932. Paper, 3 kr.

The editio princeps of the Hippiatrica by Simon Grynæus, Basel 1537, remained for nearly four centuries the only edition. In 1924 and 1927 appeared the two volumes of the edition by E. Oder and C. Hoppe, which provided a new and much better basis for the study of these writings. The text printed in vol. I is that of the codex Phillippicus 1538 (= B, now in Berlin), and the variants of M (Paris 2322) are given in the apparatus criticus. In vol. II we have the index as given in M, and such other parts of M as are not in vol. I or have been transmitted in a very different form; also such parts of the Cambridge, London and Leiden codices as it was thought desirable to publish.

The author of this dissertation has made a close study of this new edition, and at the same time of other medical writings, with a view to analysing the Corpus Hippiatricorum into its component elements and displaying its genesis. He makes full use, with due acknowledgment, of the important work done by earlier workers in this field, especially by Oder and Hoppe, both in the valuable preface to their edition and in other writings.

It appears that B and M are different recensions of an older text which may be called A. The compiler of A had before him the works of Apsyrtus, Anatolius, Eumelus, Theonnestus, Hippocrates (the veterinary surgeon), Hierocles and Pelagonius. These he excerpted in rotation for each topic in the above (roughly alphabetical) order, except that he omitted now one, now another, when he found in him nothing to his purpose (Oder and Hoppe, Preface to vol. II, p. xix). Mr. Björck is at pains to determine the share of each writer (and of two others who make their first appearance in the B recension) in the extant corpus, and examines the characteristics of each in respect of language and medical theory. In a chapter

devoted to the Arabic veterinary writers he concludes that they possessed Theonnestus.

In this dissertation the facts are marshalled with considerable skill by one whose horizon is very wide. Experts in the history of medicine will assess for themselves the importance of Mr. Björck's own contribution to the solution of these problems; those less at home in this field who wish to become acquainted with it will find in this book a good starting-point.

R. MCKENZIE.

St. John's College, Oxford.

*Historical Introduction to the Study of Roman Law.* By H. F. JOLOWICZ. Pp. xxi+545. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Cloth, 21s.

MANY classical scholars are content to know of Justinian that he was the husband of Theodora, and of Ulpian that he used the word *elucescebat*—an ascription not confirmed by the *vocabularium iurisprudentiae Romanae*. They are disgusted when a lawyer speaks of 'the earlier classical period which began with the reign of Hadrian,' and take no interest in works, such as those of Professor Buckland, which are mainly concerned with Antonine and Byzantine Law. Professor Jolowicz goes far to meet their objections, since more than half his book is concerned with the Republic. No doubt there are students of Republican history and of Cicero who know very little of Republican Law; but they must sometimes share the shame of the young Servius Sulpicius when told by Quintus Mucius *turpe esse patricio et nobili et causas oranti ius in quo versaretur ignorare*. Now they can remedy their ignorance by reading Mr. Jolowicz's 80 pages on the law at the time of the XII Tables and 125 pages on Private Law from the XII Tables to the Fall of the Republic. Unfortunately the fog which veils early Rome from our eyes hangs longer over private law than over political history, and we are very ill informed about the law even of Cicero's day. Mr. Jolowicz gives a very complete account of what we do know, and a judicious selection of modern theories. Some of his statements must be taken with a grain of salt, but only because the word 'probably' and the phrase 'if our authorities are to be believed' cannot well be inserted in every sentence, and must often be understood. The private law of the Empire is hardly touched, Professor Buckland having covered that field, but there are good accounts of the constitution, and of the machinery of government, of law-making, and of litigation, in the Principate and under the less familiar Dominate of Diocletian and Justinian.

P. W. DUFF.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

*Griechische und römische Religion* (Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft, herausgegeben von Alfred Gercke und Eduard Norden, vierte Auflage, ii. Band, 4. Heft). By SAM WIDE and M. P. NILSSON. Pp. 101. Berlin and Leipzig: Teubner, 1931. Paper.

THIS book, which did not come to the *Classical Review* till the present year, has already estab-

lished itself as one of the first-rate short manuals of the subject, a worthy part of the excellent work<sup>1</sup> to which it belongs. The beginner may consult it in the justifiable hope of finding the chief facts set forth with examples which have the double virtue of being really illustrative and not hackneyed; those somewhat more advanced will find it an excellent test of how much they know to read it through and ask themselves what proportion of it they could have written. The short account of the history of the subject with which each section ends is one of the best features. Naturally, it is no longer quite up to date, owing to the difficulty, which even the most learned labour under, of listing and criticising works which are not yet in existence; and it so happens that in 1932 some very good books were written or published, such as the second part of Wilamowitz' *Glaube der Hellenen* and Deubner's *Attische Feste*. But the earlier work of Altheim already finds a place in it, and other indications of the wide reading of the author are not wanting. Those belated students who have not yet got the book for themselves are therefore advised to do so.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

*Jocasta's Crime: An Anthropological Study.*  
By LORD RAGLAN. Pp. xii + 215. London:  
Methuen and Co., 1933. Cloth, 6s.

THE Macedonians, if we may believe Tertullian (*Apolog.* 9, *ad nat.* 1, 16), were heartily amused, when the *Oedipus* was played to them, at the idea of making such a fuss over a trifling matter like the relations of the hero to his mother. Lord Raglan is witty and often persuasive, not over incest itself, for that is a serious matter (albeit some recent researches of Malinowski indicate that the lower cultures do not always regard it with such terror as the older anthropologists make out, see his *Crime and Custom*, pp. 79-84), but over the theories which have hitherto been put forward to explain why it is almost universally thought of as an unspeakable offence, a *μίαιμα* of the very worst. For, as he has little difficulty in pointing out, the biological arguments against it are mostly unsound and, if they were not, are still far beyond the capacity and knowledge of primitive man; while the sociological and psychological explanations of the horror it arouses are generally of the feeblest. It is a pity, however, that his own theory was not propounded by someone else, for he could have been very amusing in a refutation of it. The reviewer is as unconvinced by his derivation of exogamy from a state of things in which men inhabited one side of a river while the women they casually mated with occupied the other as by the suggestion that the far-off original of *Oedipus* and *Iokaste* were a divine king and his consort, whose

holily unholy union formed part of a rite of flood and creation.

The classicist who wants a brief review of prevailing theories concerning incest will find the first or negative part of the book useful and very readable; but when the author ventures on classical ground himself, he is not very happy. Thus, his notion of the meaning of Paus. x, 12, 2, is that Artemis in a hymn 'describes herself as wife, sister and daughter of Apollo' (p. 148), an idea got by misreading Farnell, *C.G.S.* ii, p. 468—a dozen pages earlier he has an equally bad misinterpretation of Dr. Farnell's successor. Elsewhere, the author falls into the popular error of supposing that every custom mentioned in a Latin book must be Roman (see pp. 111, 115); this time the secondary authority is Briffault. There are other such slips, which will not deceive the specialist, but are misleading to the general public for whom the book is meant.

If, in addition, the reader happens to disagree with the views of Professor Elliot Smith and his school, he will find other weaknesses in the book; but this is not the place to discuss abstruse points of anthropological theory.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

*The Sounds of Latin: A Descriptive and Historical Phonology.* By ROLAND G. KENT. Pp. 216. No. XII of the Language Monographs published by the Linguistic Society of America. Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1932.

TWENTY-FIVE years of lecturing upon Latin Phonology have impressed Professor Kent with the need of a conveniently arranged handbook on the subject, composed in English and equipped with exercises. This monograph is an excellent attempt to supply that need. In the first chapter he discusses briefly various language groups—the Indo-European family and its chief characteristics, the Italic dialects, and the sources for Latin phonology and morphology. Chapter two deals with the alphabet, and there is a brief but excellent account of the pronunciation of Latin. It finishes with a discussion of accent, the primitive Indo-European accent, and an attempt to harmonize the conflicting views held about the accent of Latin. The greater part of the work occupies the fourth chapter, in which Professor Kent gives a good account of ablaut, disyllabic bases, and the method and value of studying the history of sounds. He then gives a detailed treatment of the vowel-sounds and the many changes they undergo. These are followed in order by the stops, nasals, liquids, semivowels, all admirably handled. He closes with a discussion of anaptyxis, assimilation and dissimilation, metathesis, haplology, sandhi and doublets. There are many very useful explanatory footnotes, four indexes, full documentation, and an ample bibliography, as well as a complete set of exercises based on the text. As is to be expected in a work of this kind, there is little in it that is new, but there is also very little to which one might demur. In § 141 VIII: 'atrox <ad-rōks to odor' is impossible. In § 151:

<sup>1</sup> The publishers announce that the volume of which this is the last part may be had in two half-volumes, price RM. 12 and RM. 15 respectively.



hostis had originally the velar stop initially. In § 153, n. 4, he states that *dūcō* because of Germanic forms had the labio-velar *qx* originally. Walde-Hofmann still retain \**deukō*, which is, I think, right. In § 160 II the derivations of *lumen*, *examen*, *flamma* should contain a medial *s*; thus \**leuqsmen*, not \**leuqmen*: cf. *iouxmenta*. Again, in § 166 II (b) the connection of *miser* with *maestus* is very doubtful. These, however, are but trifles, and the work should be very useful to students and is to be highly commended.

P. S. NOBLE.

University of Leeds.

*Tertullianus' Citaten uit de Evangelien en de oud-latijnsche Bijbelvertalingen.* By G. J. D. AALDERS. Pp. vi + 201. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1932. Stiff paper.

THE New Testament quotations in Tertullian's works were examined by Rönisch over sixty years ago. In view of the slight progress that has been made in the textual criticism of Tertullian within the intervening period, it may be doubted whether a fresh examination is necessary at the present time. But if it is, it should be done on the basis of the best authorities available. For instance, Waltzing's texts of the *Apology* should have been used in preference to Rauschen's (though indeed the *Apology* has of necessity very few traces of Scripture), Borleffs' edition of the *De Baptismo* (1931) instead of the Vienna edition, and the collation of the Troyes MS. of the *De carnis resurrectione*, published in 1922, should have been consulted, as also Marra's editions of the *De Corona* (1927) and *De Cultu Feminarum* (1930). The selection of old Latin texts for comparison with Tertullian is somewhat capricious. Why give *δ* and ignore *α*, especially as the latter is under no suspicion of being contaminated with the Vulgate? The two texts published by Abbott (Dublin, 1884) should have been cited. For purposes of comparison, the Westcott and Hort Greek should have been used rather than Nestle. There are misprints on pages 29, 40, 97. Matth. x 7 (*Res.* 33) has been overlooked. On p. 130 for '1, 19' read '2, 19.' There is a useful 'summary and conclusions' in English at the end of the book. This English halts here and there: (p. 197) read 'we have dwelt at greater length' for 'more amply we insisted'; (p. 198) read 'is not to be added to' for 'not is to be combined with.' The writer should have used the invaluable *Vulgata-studien* of Vogels (Münster, 1928).

While it has been necessary to point out those defects, the columns in which the author has set forth the readings of Tertullian, the Greek, *k, e, b, g<sup>1</sup>, g*, for passages quoted by Tertullian from Matthew, Mark and John will be useful to those who know how to use them, and the final conclusion 'much in TERT.'s quotations from St. Matthew and St. John raises a surmise that he goes back directly to the Greek original, although we will not deny that TERT. has already known a Latin Version or Versions and that the influences of this Version or these Versions upon his quotations might be proved'

is expressed with a worthy caution and is hardly likely to be overturned.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

*Syntaktisch-stilistische Beiträge zur Kritik und Exegese des Clemens von Alexandrien.* Von ELOV TENGBLAD. Pp. x + 103. Lund: Sundquist och Emond, 1932. Paper, kr. 4.75. STÄHLIN's admirable edition of Clement of Alexandria provides a solid basis for an investigation like this. The author has a good knowledge alike of bibliography and of method. The first part deals with *variatio sermonis*, the order of words and kindred topics; the second handles the text of various passages in the *Protrepticus*, *Paedagogus*, and *Stromateis*. The English reader will feel a little scandalized at the way in which the views of Hort and J. B. Mayor are controverted, but the writer gives serious reasons for his own opinions, and has obviously made a close study of his author. He ought, however, to have employed Gifford's edition of Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*: also, for 'J. A. Hort' (p. v) read 'F. J. A. Hort'; for 'Riddell' read 'Riddell' (p. 15); for 'Witkowsky' read 'Witkowski' (p. 23).

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

MICHELE PELLEGRINO: *La Poesia di S. Gregorio Nazianzeno.* (Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore. Serie quarta: Scienze filologiche. Volume XIII.) Pp. 109. Milan: 'Vita e Pensiero', 1932. Paper, L. 8.

THIS book is an answer to the question put to himself by the author: what living poetry are we to find in the nineteen thousand surviving lines from the pen of St. Gregory Nazianzen? Dr. Pellegrino, well aware of the faults of his author, who was of course writing in a language which was by his time only a literary tradition, is able to answer that in Gregory's verses we must see the subjective poetry of a Christian priest reacting against the objective poetry of the pagan Greeks. Due to this subjectivity is the relative excellence of his autobiographical poems: in this indeed Gregory was a pioneer in Christian literature. The same contrast is apparent in his treatment of nature. Gregory feels nature rather than sees its plasticity, as the classical poets saw it. Everywhere he marks a step away from the ancient and towards the modern world: Pellegrino might have added that he is one of the first Byzantine writers.

Gregory wrote almost entirely in quantitative metres in a language which was by then pronounced entirely by accent. Hence his numerous false quantities. One of the worst is in the lines which he composed on his death-bed: we hear the Christian poet telling us with his last breath that the days of pagan poetry are gone for ever.

Pellegrino finally analyses two of the best poems. It was a happy idea to show the poet, against whom so much must be said, at his best, and this best Pellegrino defines as the



inspired hymnody which results when theological thought leads the poet to lyrical contemplation. The book is in fact full of acute criticism, which has a much wider application than merely to the poems of Gregory. We see the essential and inevitable change which came upon poetry when the pen was taken up by Christians. But to most readers the undoubted approach to a more modern style will hardly compensate for what has been lost. Gregory, as Paton has said, evidently enjoyed making verses, though it is now tedious to read them: in this arid field Dr. Pellegrino has cut a fresh furrow.

I note a few misprints: *παρασάβευον* on p. 54; *πρεσβύτεροι* on p. 56; *τεχούσης* on p. 59; *ζοῆς* on p. 60; *γαῖαν* on p. 71; *χρησαμένηον* on p. 98.

R. M. DAWKINS.

Exeter College, Oxford.

*The Archaeology of Yorkshire.* (The County Archaeologies.) By F. and H. W. ELGEE. Pp. xv+272; 12 plates; 42 illustrations in text; 2 maps. London: Methuen, 1933. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

THE authors of this latest addition to the County Archaeologies confess their hesitation in dealing thus briefly with 'so extensive and varied a shire,' a plea justifiably repeated when they turn to the Roman period. Chronological treatment in fifty-five pages is here confronted not only by a wealth of archaeological material but by a diversity of cultural levels coexistent within an area which 'corresponds to no inevitable division of Roman Britain,' and in its lowlands and highlands displays a unique union of the civil and military aspects of the

occupation. Within these limits one can approve the general adequacy of the work, and the skill with which the manifold aspects of civil and military history of Roman and of native are presented, from the basis of Agricola's governorship (oddly dated '77-85 or 6') and a somewhat lengthy discussion of 'undated' Roman roads. Occasional degeneration into a catalogue of remains was perhaps inevitable, but many unnecessary errors have crept in. The following may be noted: Deae Matrae (p. 143); Jovi dilecti (beloved Jove) (147); *Syntaxis Mathematicae* (148); Deae Syria (149); *Ilers* (151); Quintilius (159). Mistranslations appear on 143, 147, 163. Again, at Slack (129) the headquarters were originally stone; details on mining (135) need correction; the Trajanic building inscription from York (139) does not date 'from 110'; the late-4th-c. refortification of Ilkley is ignored (158); a ninth milestone (Decius: Aldborough, 1924) should be added on p. 157, and the bronze rule removed from evidence for Chi-Rho on p. 163. Imperial dates are wrong on pp. 150, 151, 156, 173. Valuable space could have been saved by restricting or rearranging inscriptions and by reduction of the Longwood altar (Fig. 24) to reasonable scale.

G. CLEMENT WHITTICK.

Armstrong College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

THE heading of the review of Ullman's *Ancient Writing and its Influence* in C.R. XLVII. 71 should have mentioned that Messrs. Harrap are the publishers of the book in this country, and that the English price is 5s.

## CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,

I am indeed obliged to Professor Summers for his kind reference in the May number (p. 77) to my small brochure looking towards an improvement of the text of Seneca's Letters. I am afraid, however, that if the last sentence of his review is allowed to go unchallenged, in which he represents me as translating *si amici deciperent* by 'if your friends have de-

ceived you (as they have),' it will be difficult to understand his earlier reference to my 'good sense and discretion,' considering that no tolerably informed schoolboy could be pardoned for perpetrating such a mistranslation. Following Pincianus, I proposed to read *deceperunt* for *deciperent*, in which case my rendering will be right even if my emendation is wrong.

Very truly yours,

W. H. ALEXANDER.

University of Alberta.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

### THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

VOL. XXVI. NOS. 17-23 (MARCH-APRIL, 1933).

H. C. Nutting, *Juv.* III. 72, *viscera magnarum domum*, 'adopted sons.' III. 90-1 perhaps recall Nero's musical pretensions and the pun made when Vindex revolted, *etiam Gallos eum cantando excitasse* (Suet. Nero 45). *Lucan* I. 203, *tibi*, 'in your eyes.' II. 314,

*externi . . . clientes* is possible. III. 504-9, illustrated by Tac. *Hist.* I. 40. 4. IV. 259, *ipsa turba* does not mean 'very number.' V. 571, *Francken* need not object to groans heard in battle. VI. 666, 'I have held nothing back.' Horace, *Odes* I. 9. 15, *nec dulcis amores sperne puer neque tu choreas*: other examples of such a use of pronouns. Suet. Nero 33, *bustum . . . consaequiri neglex-erit*: the passive has full force as in Suet.

Tib. 41. Tac. *Annals* II. 71: Tac. has in mind Soph. *Trach.* 1046-1102 as translated by Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* II. 20-22. E. S. McCartney, 'And which' with no preceding 'which.' Freely used in Latin, e.g. Tac. *A. II.* 88, *liberator Germaniae et qui florentissimum imperium lacerasset.* Ch. Knapp adds other examples of co-ordination of thought rather than of form, e.g. Virg. *Aen.* VI. 640. K. Guinagh, *Cicero's Recovery of his Palatine Site.* The implacability of Clodius suggests that Cicero's witness against him was exaggerated or invented, perhaps from the motive indicated by Plut. *Cic.* 29. H. R. Fairclough, *Primis ab Annis, Virgil, Aen.* II. 87: 'from my earliest years, in spite of B. W. Mitchell, *C.W.*, January, 1933. W. M. Green, *The Ritual Validity of the Ludi Scaenici.* Vitiating by any interruption of the dancing or music, Cic. *Har. Resp.* 23: hence a proverb *salva res est, saltat senex* (Serv. ad *Aen.* III. 279, Festus). Fr. Bilabel, *The Early History of the Greek People and the Indogermanic Migrations* (two articles). One strong wave entered Greece and Asia Minor about 2000 B.C., another (Dorians and Phrygo-Thracians) in the thirteenth century B.C. The coast of Asia Minor was already being settled from Greece in the fourteenth (Hittite texts discussed). P. S. Miller, *On the Division of History into Epochs.* Marcus Aurelius VII. 1 already speaks of 'ancient, medieval and modern.' E. J. Urch, *The Origin of the Actio per Formulam.* Begun by the praetor peregrinus and gradually adapted by other praetors as less tediously formal than the actio per sacramentum or the interdictal process. N. Lewis, 'Ἡ Πρώτη Στήλη. Not the 'first floor' of European usage but the first ceiling or ground floor: evidence from papyri. M. Reinhold, *A Contribution to Biographical Chronology.* Roman writers are often loose in expressions of age, e.g. *nonum decimum annum ingressus* Vell. Pat. II. 61, *anno nono decimo* Tac. *A.* XIII. 6, to represent *annos undeviginti natus* of Mon. Ancyr. 1. Id., *The Perusine War.* A logical sequence of events can be worked out from the fragmentary and confused accounts. J. H. Mozley, *The Uses of Pendeo and Suspendo in Latin Poetry.* Various writers give modern illustrations for undying fires, the cave of bats (Hom. *Od.* 24. 5), etc.

REVIEWS.—Fr. Preisigke and E. Kiessling, *Wörterbuch Griech. Papyrusurkunden* III, Berlin, 1931. Indispensable, though inconveniently arranged (C. J. Kraemer, Jr.). W. Judeich, *Topographie von Athen*, new ed., Munich, 1931. Detailed review, with discussion of the inscription Eph. Arch. 1884, 166 (J. Day). Thelma B. DeGrafi, *Naevian Studies*, New York, 1931. Clearly presents the controversial matter (Catharine Saunders). *Yale Classical Studies* III, ed. A. M. Harmon, 1932. Favourable (M. Hadas). Florence E. Wallace, *Color in Homer and in Ancient Art*, Northampton, Mass., 1927. Favourable (Alice E. Kober). W. B. McDaniel, *Poems of Catullus*, New York, 1931. Criticisms by C. J. Fordyce.

## GNOMON.

(IX. 3. MARCH, 1933.)

(A reference to C.R. denotes a review already published in the *Classical Review*.)

*Homeri Ilias.* Ed. T. W. Allen [C.R. XLVI. 12] (Jacoby). J. respects A.'s exhaustive labours, but regrets the form of the book, which, as a critical edition, is a failure. Collations of individual MSS. should have been relegated to appendices, and a fresh inspection of Eustathius's commentary would have borne more fruit than reports of the readings of many of the MSS. *The Platonic Epistles.* Translated with Introduction by J. Harward [C.R. XLVI. 212] (Pohlenz). The translation is commendably clear and accurate, though H. should have used Souilhé's edition. P. discusses H.'s views on the authenticity of the Letters at length and on the whole favourably. *L'Empereur Julien: Œuvres complètes.* 1. 1. *Discours de Julien César.* Texte établi et traduit par J. Bidez [C.R. XLVI. 276] (Latte). B. has greatly improved the text, and his translation is able. L. criticizes details. *Römische Geschichte:* 1. *Die römische Republik* by J. Vogt (pp. x+350, 9 plates); 2. *Die römische Kaiserzeit* by J. Wolf (pp. viii+286, 8 plates) [Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1932] (Hohl). W.'s book is full of gross errors and valueless. V.'s is attractive and scholarly, though too much inclined to generalize and idealize. E. Fiechter: *Das Theater in Oropos; Die Theater von Oiniadai und Neupoleon; Das Theater von Sikyon* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930-1. 3 vols., pp. 27, 24, 32; numerous illustrations] (v. Gerkan). F., while often correcting and supplementing earlier reports, has spent too little time at some of the sites which he describes, and his accounts are marred by serious omissions as well as by false judgments. But the first three volumes of this comprehensive survey of the remains of Greek theatres are welcome. Vladimir Dumitrescu: *L'età del ferro nel Piceno fino all' invasione dei Galli-Senoni* [Bucharest: Tipogr. del Giornale Universul, 1929. Pp. 215, 9 plates, 20 illustrations 4°] (Messerschmidt). The complicated question of the relationships between the different Italian peoples can never be solved till unprejudiced accounts of each are published. M. approves of D.'s work as a whole, though he disagrees with some of his conclusions. Carlo del Grande: *Sviluppo musicale dei metri greci* [Naples: Stab. Industrie editoriali meridionali, 1927. Pp. 144 (from Rivista Indo-Greco-Italica XI)] (Wagner). G. is well read and has the courage to strike out on a path of his own, but his aim is too ambitious. He has no sure foundations, and many of his conclusions are fanciful or manifestly wrong. A. Turyn: *De codicibus Pindaricis* [Cracow, 1932. Pp. 90 (Archiwum Filologiczne 11)] (Maas). T. deals with the MSS. other than those of Moschopoulos, Thomas and Triklinios, and a stemma, not attempted by Schroeder, would be valuable if trustworthy.

T.'s is vitiated by unscientific methods. His own results do not justify his contempt for Schroeder. W. Aly: *Neue Beiträge zur Straßon-Ueberlieferung* [Heidelberg: Winter, 1931. Pp. 32 (SBHeid. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1931-2, 1)] (Honigmann). Further inspection of MSS. Vat. gr. 2061A and 2306 have resulted in the identification of nearly a sixth of the pages. The evidence is important not only where the main tradition fails, but also where it seemed to be correct. E. Nachmanson: *Nya Testamentet. En översikt av dess yttre historia* (Stockholm: Gebers, 1932. Pp. 165, 25 illustrations) (v. Dobschütz). A textual history of the N.T. primarily addressed to Swedish readers. The argument is discursive and often irrelevant. In grouping the MSS. N. follows, with some discrepancies, the doubtful scheme of v. Soden. C. Schuchhardt: *Die Römer als Nachahmer im Landwehr- und Lagerbau* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1931. Pp. 29, 25 illustrations 4° (SBBerl. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1931, 23)] (Kornemann). K., with some reservations, commends the work as useful and interesting. H. Türck: 1. *Der geniale Mensch*, 14th edition (pp. 429), 2. *Pandora und Eva* (pp. viii+107) [Weimar: Verus-Verlag, 1931] (Lesky). 1. is a provocative book which will interest many though it may convince few. More relevant to classical scholarship is the first part of 2. In dealing with the Pandora myth T. seeks to prove that Hesiod conceived of Elpis as an evil. L. admits the logic of the theory, but shows at some length that it is untenable. *Literarischer Wegweiser für den altsprachlichen Unterricht* [Baden bei Wien: Rohrer, 1931. Pp. 126, 4 illustrations] (Sieveling). A useful bibliography, which would be more welcome if it omitted a number of familiar books in favour of less known modern works.

## (IX. 4. APRIL, 1933.)

A. W. Persson: *The Royal Tombs at Dendra near Midea*, with contributions by Fr. Rathgen, A. Fredga, A. J. B. Wace [C.R. XLVI. 181] (Schweitzer). The results of an important excavation are well described, though not so well illustrated. P.'s numerous conjectures are of uneven merit, but his enthusiasm and industry are praiseworthy. A detailed review. J. Stenzel: 1. *Metaphysik des Allertums* [Munich: Oldenbourg, 1931. Pp. 196]; 2. *Studien zur Entwicklung der Platonischen Dialektik von Sokrates zu Aristoteles*. 2nd edition, enlarged [C.R. XLVI. 211] (Stocks). 1. a masterly book, particularly valuable for its accounts of Platonism and Eleaticism, but suggestive throughout. 2. differs from the earlier edition only in the inclusion of three new papers which further support P.'s thesis that the Socratic-Platonic metaphysics has its roots in the ethical problem. A welcome reprint. R. Maschke: *Die Willenslehre im griechischen Recht* [Berlin: Stilke, 1926. Pp. viii+302] (Zucker). A book of particular importance for classical scholarship, because it deals with the mental and moral edifice of the early and classical period,

with questions which stand right at the centre of work in the Greek field. *Conferenze per il XIV centenario delle pandette*, 15 dicembre 530-15 dicembre 1930 [Milan: Soc. Vita e Pensiero, 1931. Pp. x+373] (Wieacker). Reviewer welcomes a reaction against the narrowing tendency of recent work on the Digest, giving comments, mostly favourable, on the contributions made by the various experts. *Atti del 2° Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani* Voll. I-III [Rome, 1931. Pp. 552, 40 plates; pp. 815, 25 plates; pp. 605, 3 plates] (Solari). The periods treated range from pre-history to present-day Rome. C. C. Edgar: *Zenon Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection* [C.R. XLV. 180] (Viereck). An interesting collection of papyri admirably edited. The introduction comprises a short historical sketch, the fullest possible accounts of Apollonius and Zenon, and a very clear discussion of the problems of dating. V. contributes notes on some of the papyri. E. G. Suhr: *Sculptured Portraits of Greek Statesmen with a special study of Alexander the Great* [C.R. XLVI. 184] (Lippold). The book adds nothing to our knowledge, but might occasionally be useful for reference if it had an index.—Notes on excavations in the Kerameikos, by K. Kübler. Obituary notice of Stéphane Gsell by A. Schulten. Bibliographical Supplement, 1933, No. 2 (down to 31 March, 1933).

## (IX. 5. MAY, 1933.)

1. T. G. Tucker: *A concise etymological dictionary of Latin* [C.R. XLVI. 134]; 2. A. Walde: *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Third edition revised by J. B. Hofmann, parts 1-6 [Heidelberg: Winter, 1930-2] (Leumann). L. devotes ten pages to a survey of previous etymological work, one to T., and seven to W.-H., including a detailed discussion of three words *exempli gratia*. His conclusion is that T.'s book is merely a curiosity, W.-H.'s indispensable, though not perfect. *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae*. Editorum in usum edidit A. E. Housman [C.R. XLVI. 90] (Knoche). The text and apparatus do not essentially differ from those of the 1905 edition, but the lengthened preface deals with some later theories and makes a few additions and corrections, on which reviewer adds notes. H.'s work is of the first importance, though marred by too frequent misquotation of readings and over-violent criticism. *M. Manilii Astronomicorum libri 2, 3, 4, 5*. Recensuit et enarravit A. E. Housman [London, 1912-30] *M. Manilii Astronomica* recensuit A. E. Housman. Editio minor [C.R. XLVII. 26] (Bickel). H.'s doctrinaire contempt for traditional methods detracts not a little from the value of his text, which is further damaged by a 'fatal inclination to palaeographical jugglery' in his conjectures; these, however, are modified in the ed. minor. As an interpreter H. fails because he relies on textual criticism where philosophical insight is indispensable. L. Illeg:



*Die Form der pindarischen Erzählung* [C.R. XLVI. 231] (Dornseiff). I. bases his argument on a questionable theory of the importance of Paradeigma, against which D. inveighs. But he says much that no reader of Pindar can afford to ignore. H. Schaal: *Vom Tauschhandel zum Welthandel* [C.R. XLVI. 61] (Schuchhardt). A sound but lively book which will fascinate and instruct both scholars and the general public. Grace H. Macurdy: *Hellenistic Queens* [C.R. XLVI. 167] (Kahrstedt). Biographical sketches usefully summarizing the known facts about each queen without attempting to add much that is new. K. notes a few mistakes and inconsistencies. M. Cary and E. H. Warmington: *The Ancient Explorers* [C.R. XLIV. 226] (Hohl). A useful book written with excellent judgment and in an engaging style. P. Schnabel: *Die Entstehungsgeschichte des kartographischen Erdbildes des Klaudios Ptolemaios* [Pp. 37, 1 illustration (SBBerl. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1930, 14)] (Wirtz). The title is misleading, but the author, in his discussion of five of Ptolemy's works, raises many points which are stimulating, if not always convincing. *Cassii Dionis . . . quae supersunt* ed. U. P. Boissevain. Vol. V: *Index Graecitatis quem composuit W. Nawijn* [Berlin: Weidmann, 1931. Pp. vi+879] (Schmid). A painstaking index in which S. has found few mistakes; but an ideal index of Dio would be more complete and offer material e.g. for an enquiry into the development of the use of particles. V. Burr: *Nostrum mare* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1932. Pp. x+141 (Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswiss. 4)] (Ronconi). B., in his discussion of the names of seas in general, has reached the conclusions expressed by R. (Stud. It. N. S. 9, 193-242, 257-331). While agreeing with B. that *nostrum mare* originally meant the sea of ἡ οἰκουμένη, R. holds that Romans such as Caesar and Cicero used it exclusively in the sense of the sea controlled by Rome. G. Rohde: *Die Bedeutung der Tempelgründungen im Staatsleben der Römer* [C.R. XLVII. 86] (Kornemann). R.'s conclusions are mostly certain and of great value to historians of religion and politics alike. L. Strzelecki: *Quaestiones Verrianae* [C.R. XLVII. 78] (Lindsay). An opusculum full of promise, marked by sober argument and fair treatment of difficulties. Noteworthy is the confirmation of Reitzenstein's view of the relation of the alphabetical to the non-alphabetical part of Verrius.

(IX. 6. JUNE, 1933.)

K. Latte: *Ein neues Fragment aus der Niobe des Aischylos* [Berlin: Weidmann (Nachr. Gött., Phil.-hist. Kl. 1933, 22-29)] (Maas). M. gives a facsimile and transcript, noting the restorations of L., himself and others. R. Delbrueck: *Antike Porphyrrwerke* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1932. Pp. 245, 122 illustrations, 112 plates 4°] (Sieveking). A model catalogue. Emma Stiassny-Jacobsohn: *Formprobleme der antiken Kunst* [Vienna: Krystall-Verlag, 1931. Pp. 82, 29 illustra-

tions] (Kaschnitz-Weinberg). The two essays on Composition would be serviceable if comprehensive. Little emerges from the essays on the attitude of Socrates and Plato to art. F. Taeger: *Der Friede von 362-1* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930. Pp. 67 (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswiss. 11)] (W. Schwahn: *Heeresmatrikel und Landfriede Philipps von Makedonien* [C.R. XLV. 88] (Berve). T.'s enquiry is on a fruitful subject, but is spoilt by his failure to distinguish between the panhellenic idealism of an Isocrates and the practical aims of the times. S. makes some acute observations on individual points, but neither he nor T. does much to advance our knowledge of the fourth century. U. Wilcken: 1. *Zu den impensae der res gestae Divi Augusti*; 2. *Zur Genesis der res gestae Divi Augusti* [Berlin: de Gruyter. Pp. 16 and 21 (SBBerl. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1931, 27 and 1932, 11)] (Koepp). Each paper furthers our comprehension of this invaluable document. The first is convincing; the second, which is principally concerned with the disputed sentence about Germany (Ch. 26), does not shake K.'s opinion that the document was written all together, not as a serial. *Septimi Tertulliani*: 1. *de Corona liber* (pp. xxvii+47), 2. *de cultu seminarum libri duo* (pp. xxxviii+47). Rec. J. Marra [C.R. XLV. 42] (Kroymann). The prefaces are attractive and throw new light on the dates of the treatises. The text of 2., for which K. has himself collected the material for the Vienna edition, is examined in some detail. M. has some bad mistakes, particularly in connexion with the codex Agobardinus; but the difficulties are great and his books deserve readers. G. N. Cross: *Epirus* [C.R. XLVI. 261] (Ehrenberg). E. criticizes details, but admits the inconclusiveness of the evidence and calls the book as a whole clever, thoughtful and helpful. O. Huth: *Janus* [Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1932. Pp. 96] (Rose). H.'s ingenious theories are quite unsupported by evidence; his argument based on simple logical fallacies. Further, he demands of barbarians an incredible capacity for abstract thought. H. Herter: *De Priapo* [C.R. XLVI. 158] (Biehler). A thoroughly good treatment of all the evidence both literary and artistic.—Notes on the new fragments of Gaius by E. Albertario derived from a paper by V. Arangio-Ruiz. Obituary notice of Karl Praechter by O. Rieth. Bibliographical Supplement 1933, No. 3 (down to 31 May, 1933).

#### PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(APRIL-JUNE, 1933.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—*Testimonia Aristophanea cum scholiorum lectionibus*. W. Kraus [C.R. XLVII. 83] (Wüst). Collection of all passages in later Greek literature containing quotations from Aristophanes. Reliable and complete, though W. has a few additions to make. Most welcome to editors and textual critics.—*L'Empereur Julien*.



*Œuvres complètes, Tome I, i.* J. Bidez [C.R. XLVI. 276] (Richtsteig). The first satisfactory edition of Julian and the one by which he will in future be quoted. Careful text which at last provides a firm foundation for research; critical apparatus a pattern of clarity.—W. Heintz, *Studien zu Sextus Empiricus* [C.R. XLVI. 211] (Philippson). Intensive and penetrating critical examination of the text of Sextus, which is improved in hundreds of passages.

**LATIN LITERATURE.**—E. Cesareo, *La poesia di Calpurnio Siculo* [C.R. XLVI. 267] (Hosius). A mainly aesthetic commentary on the eclogues of Calpurnius, for whom C. is full of praise. H. cannot share C.'s highest estimate of his 'vero poeta e qualche volte un grande poeta.'—*Plauti Mercator*. P. J. Enk [Leyden, 1932, Sijthoff] (Klotz). Acceptable text and good commentary; all the more welcome as the Mercator has been long neglected. K. makes a number of criticisms.—*Horace Satires*. F. Villeneuve [C.R. XLVII. 38] (Hosius). Shows same care and judgment as the edition of the Odes (1927).—*Decimi Magni Ausonii Mosella* mit einer Einführung in die Zeit und die Welt des Dichters übersetzt u. erklärt von W. John [Trier, 1932, Paulinusdruckerei. Pp. 150, with 22 plates] (Hosius). Intended for the educated general public rather than the specialist. Skillful sketch of Ausonius' times and milieu; good commentary; more than 60 excellent and most instructive illustrations.

**HISTORY.**—A. Piganiol, *L'Empereur Constantin* [Paris, 1932, 'Les éditions Rieder.' Pp. 246] (Lenschau). Devoted mainly to C.'s religious policy; political events kept more in the background. L. summarizes the contents.—V. Burr, *Nostrum Mare*, Würzb. Studien z. Altertumsw., Heft 4 [Stuttgart, 1932, Kohlhammer. Pp. 141, with 15 maps] (Philipp). Examines origin and history of the names for the Mediterranean and its various divisions. Deserves gratitude of historical geographers.—J. Carcopino, *Sylla ou la monarchie manquée* [C.R. XLVI. 128] (Stein). Differs in essential points from the judgment of previous writers. Contains much that is of value and certainly right, though S. is not able to follow him everywhere.—A. Bessmertny, *Das Atlantisrätsel* [Leipzig, 1932, Voigtländer. Pp. 212, with 29 figures and 8 plates] (Philipp). History and explanation of the theories about Atlantis. Indispensable

to all engaged on this problem. Copious bibliography.

**PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.**—B. N. Tatakis, *Panätius de Rhodes, le fondateur du moyen Stoïcisme. Sa vie et son œuvre* [Paris, 1931. Pp. ii+234] (Philippson). Well written, but contains little that is new. Ph. disagrees on many points and advises caution in reading an undeniably stimulating book.—W. Theiler, *Die Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus* [C.R. XLV. 181] (Nestle). Excellent work as regards both critical method of dealing with sources and wealth of new results. Enriches and advances history of Greek philosophy and religion.—F. Jacobi, *Πάντες θεοί*. Diss. inaug. [Halle, 1930. Pp. vii+133] (Pfister). Admirable dissertation which increases very considerably the material already available and shows sound training in dealing with it. *Πάντες θεοί*, though invoked from Homer onwards, did not become a cult till Hellenistic times, beginning in the east and coming thence to Greece proper.—G. Rohr, *Platon's Stellung zur Geschichte* [C.R. XLVI. 211] (Nestle). Very thorough piece of work; deserves wide recognition.—L. Vitali, *Fonti per la storia della religione Cyrenaica* [C.R. XLVI. 274] (Pfister). Collects the literary material down to mediaeval times, together with epigraphical, numismatic, and archaeological records. Arranged alphabetically by the individual deities. P. finds some gaps and misses especially some of the more recently discovered material.—H. Sjövall, *Zeus im altgriechischen Hauskult* [C.R. XLVI. 181] (Keyssner). Examines the various functions of Zeus as a god of the home, and draws many interesting comparisons with Scandinavian parallels.

**ARCHAEOLOGY.**—*Römische Grabmäler des Mosellandes und der angrenzenden Gebiete. Bd. II: Die Grabmäler von Neumagen*. Bearbeitet von W. von Massow [Berlin, 1932, de Gruyter] (Watzinger). Excellent presentation of the material, together with 68 plates and 150 figures of details and restorations.—B. N. Grakov, *Altgriechische keramische Stempel mit den Namen der Astynomen*. Russ. Ass. wissensch. Forschungsinstitute. In Russian [Moscow, 1929. Pp. 223, with 19 plates] (Kocevalov). In spite of some weaknesses G.'s work, based on laborious examination of vast material, is of utmost importance. K. discusses and criticizes at considerable length.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

\* \* Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Austin (R. G.) *M. Tulli Ciceronis pro M. Caelio oratio*. Edited by R. G. A. Pp. xx+131. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1933. Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.

Axelsson (B.) *Senecastudien. Kritische Be-*

*merkungen zu Senecas Naturales Quaestiones*. Pp. viii+119. (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N.F. Avd. 1. Bd. 29. Nr. 3.) Lund: Universitetets-Biblioteket, 1933. Paper, 4 kr.

- Baty* (C. W.) *T. Livi Ab Vrbe Condita liber II* 1-40. Edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary. Pp. 176; illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1933. Cloth, 1s. 9d.
- Blakeney* (E. H.) *Ausonius. The Mosella*. Translated into English verse by E. H. B., who has added an Introductory Note and a Commentary upon the Text. With a foreword by J. W. Mackail. Pp. xxii+74. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1933. Cloth, 16s.
- Blomgren* (S.) *Studia Fortunatiana*. Pp. xv+216. (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1933.) Uppsala: Lundequist, 1933. Paper, 7 kr.
- Boak* (A. E. R.) *Karanis. The temples, coin hoards, botanical and zoological reports, seasons 1924-31*. Pp. xi+93; plates. (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XXX.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1933. Cloth, \$2.50.
- Bolkestein* (H.) *Τέλος ὁ γάμος*. Pp. 27. (Mededeelingen der Kon. Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Deel 76, Serie B, No. 2.) Amsterdam, 1933. Paper, fl. 0.60.
- Boulanger* (A.) *Tertullien de Spectaculis suivi de Pseudo-Cyprien de Spectaculis*. Pp. 115. (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg. Textes d'étude, 1.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1933. Paper, 10 fr.
- Braginton* (M. V.) *The Supernatural in Seneca's Tragedies*. Pp. 98. Menasha (Wisconsin): George Banta Publishing Co., 1933. Paper, \$1.
- Buckler* (W. H.) and *Robinson* (D. M.) *Sardis. Vol. vii. Greek and Latin Inscriptions. Part I*. Pp. 198, 12 plates. Leyden: Brill, 1932.
- Calogero* (G.) *Studi sull' Eleatismo*. Pp. 265. (Pubblicazioni della Scuola di Filosofia della R. Università di Roma, III.) Rome: Tipografia del Senato, 1932. Paper, L. 40.
- Collingwood Bruce* (J.) *The Handbook to the Roman Wall*. Ninth edition, edited by R. G. Collingwood. Pp. x+221; illustrations. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Andrew Reid, 1933. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Croft* (A. M.) *Easy Exercises in Latin Syntax*. Pp. 95. Extracts from Latin Poetry for Beginners. Pp. 91. London, etc.: Harrap, 1933. Cloth, 1s. 6d. each.
- Dale* (F. R.) and *Henderson* (G. G.) *Paginae Primae. A First Latin Course*. Pp. viii+152. London and Glasgow: Blackie, 1933. Cloth, 2s. 9d.
- della Valle* (E.) *Il Ciclope d' Euripide tradotto in versi italiani con un saggio critico sul dramma*. Pp. 101. Bari: Laterza, 1933. Paper.
- de Vreesse* (L. C. P. J.) *Augustinus en de Astrologie*. Pp. 119. Maastricht: Veltman, 1933. Paper.
- Dodds* (E. R.) *Proclus. The Elements of Theology. A revised Text with Translation, Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1933. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Dornseiff* (F.) *Die archaische Mythen Erzählung. Folgerungen aus dem homerischen Apollonhymnos*. Pp. 103. Berlin and Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1933. Paper, RM. 4.50.
- Drerup* (E.) *Die Generationsproblem in der griechischen und griechisch-römischen Kultur. Nebst einem Anhang: Die klassische Schönheit der altgriechischen Dichtung*. Pp. 160. (Studien z. Gesch. u. Kultur d. Altertums, XVIII. Band, I. Heft.) Paderborn: Schöningh, 1933.
- Duckworth* (G. E.) *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Vergil*. Pp. 125. Princeton: Princeton University Press (London: Milford), 1933. Paper, 9s. net.
- Ewert* (A.) *The French Language*. Pp. xii+437. (The Great Languages.) London: Faber, 1933. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Fairbanks* (A.) *Greek art, the basis of later European art*. Pp. x+136; illustrations. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) London, etc.: Harrap, 1933. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Frank* (T.) *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*. Edited by T. F. Vol. I: Rome and Italy of the Republic. By T. F. Pp. xiv+431. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1933. Cloth, \$3 (16s.) net.
- Gagner* (A.) *Studien zur Bedeutung der Präposition APVD*. Pp. xiii+178. (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1931. Filosofi . . . , 3.) Uppsala: Lundequist. Paper.
- Gauger* (H.) *Optische und akustische Sinnesdaten in den Dichtungen des Vergil und Horaz*. Pp. vi+81. (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 16. Heft.) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1932. Paper, RM. 6.
- Ghisalberti* (F.) *Arnolfo d'Orléans. Un cultore di Ovidio nel secolo XII*. Pp. 78. (Mem. del R. Ist. Lomb. di Scienze e Lettere, Vol. XXIV, Fasc. IV.) Milan: Hoepli, 1932. Paper, L. 20.
- Glots* (G.) *Histoire Générale. Histoire Ancienne. Troisième Partie. Histoire Romaine. Tome III. Le Haut-Empire. Par L. Homo*. Pp. 668. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1933. Paper, 60 francs.
- Gomme* (A. W.) *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* Pp. vii+87. (Glasgow University Publications, XXVIII.) Oxford: Blackwell, 1933. Boards, 5s. net.
- Gude* (M.) *A History of Olynthos, with a Prosopographia and Testimonia*. Pp. xii+110. (The John Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 17.) Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford). Cloth, \$2.50 (12s. 6d.).
- Haag* (E.) *Platons Kratylos. Versuch einer Interpretation*. Pp. xi+95. (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 19. Heft.) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933. Paper, M. 4.80.
- Haarkhoff* (T. J.) *The Holistic Attitude in Education*. Pp. 12. (Our Changing World-view, Lecture VII.) Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand Press, 1932. Paper, 1s. 6d.
- Haight* (E. H.) *Romance in the Latin Elegiac Poets*. Pp. xii+243. New York: Longmans, 1932. Cloth, \$2.50.
- Halliday* (W. R.) *Indo-European Folk-tales*

- and Greek Legend. Pp. 158. Cambridge: University Press, 1933. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. XLIII. Pp. 179. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Heidel* (W. A.) A Suggestion concerning Plato's Atlantis. Pp. 189-228. (Proc. American Acad. of Arts and Sciences, 68-6.) Boston: Library of the Academy, 1933. Paper, \$0.85.
- Hesperia*. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. II.: Part II. Pp. 256; 112 figures, 10 plates. Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1933. Paper.
- Hesl* (O.) Catull und das griechische Epigramm. Pp. viii+78. (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 17. Heft.) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1932. Paper, RM. 4.50.
- Honorat* (M.) Démonstration de la Parenté des Langues indo-européennes et sémitiques. Pp. 398. Paris: Geuthner, 1933. Paper.
- Inscriptiones Italiae*. Academiae Italiae consociatae ediderunt. Volumen XI: Regio XI. Fasc. I: Augusta Praetoria. Curavit P. Barocelli. Pp. xx+65; 6 plates. Fasc. II: Eporidia. Curavit J. Corradi. Pp. xv+33. Rome: Libreria del Stato, 1931, 1932. Paper, L. 60 and 30.
- Jacoby* (F.) Der homerische Apollonhymnos. Pp. 72. (Sonderausgabe aus den Szb. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Ph.-Hist. Kl. 1933. XV.) Berlin: de Gruyter, 1933. Paper, RM. 4.50.
- Jax* (K.) Die weibliche Schönheit in der griechischen Dichtung. Pp. 216. Innsbruck: Wagner, 1933. Paper, RM. 7.50.
- Jensen* (C.) Ein neuer Brief Epikurs. Wiedergestellt u. erklärt. Pp. 94. (Abh. d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl., 3. Folge, Nr. 5.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1933. Paper, RM. 8.
- Jones* (H. L.) The Geography of Strabo. With an English translation. In eight volumes. VIII. Pp. 510; 3 maps. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1932. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Jones* (W. H. S.) Pausanias. Description of Greece. With an English translation. In six volumes. III. Books VI-VIII (I-XXI). Pp. 441. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam), 1933. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Knögel* (W.) Der Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem. Pp. 95. (Klassisch-Philologische Studien herausg. v. Bickel u. Jensen, Heft 5.) Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1933. Paper, RM. 4.
- Krass* (W.) Stasimon. Untersuchungen zu Form und Gehalt der griechischen Tragödie. Pp. vii+325. Berlin: Weidmann, 1933. Paper, RM. 18.
- Laidlaw* (W. A.) A History of Delos. Pp. 308; 8 illustrations, 1 plan. Oxford: Blackwell, 1933. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Liddell and Scott*. A Greek-English Lexicon. A new edition. Part 7.  $\alpha\iota$ - $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\phi\omicron\upsilon\pi\omicron\varsigma$ . Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933. Paper, 10s. 6d. net.
- Maas* (P.) Epidaurische Hymnen. Pp. 127-162; 3 plates. (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, 9. Jahr, Heft 5.) Halle (Saale): Niemeyer, 1933. Paper, RM. 5.
- Mariès* (L.) Etudes préliminaires à l'édition de Diodore de Tarse sur les Psaumes. Pp. 184. (Collection d'Etudes anciennes.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1933. Paper, 30 fr.
- Martin* (J.) Q. Septimii Florentis Tertulliani Apologeticum recensuit adnotavit praefatus est J. M. Pp. 176. (Florilegium Patristicum, Fasc. VI.) Bonn: Hanstein, 1933. Stiff paper, RM. 6.
- Martini* (E.) Einleitung zu Ovid. Pp. xv+102. (Schriften der Philosophischen Fakultät der Deutschen Universität in Prag, 12. Band.) Brünn, Prag, Leipzig, Vienna: Rohrer, 1933. Paper, M. 8.
- Mayser* (E.) Grammatik der griechischen Papyri. Band II 2: Satzlehre. Analytischer Teil. Zweite Hälfte, 1. Lieferung. Pp. xiv+336. Berlin and Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1933. Paper.
- Mitchinson* (N.) The Delicate Fire. Short Stories and Poems. Pp. 360. London and Toronto: Jonathan Cape, 1933. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Morland* (H.) Der lateinische Komparationsklausus und dessen Ersatz. Pp. 26. Oslo: printed by Fabritius og Sønner, 1933. Paper.
- Morland* (H.) Rufus de Podagra. Pp. 39. (Symbolae Osloenses Fasc. Supplet. VI.) Oslo: Brøgger, 1933. Paper.
- Neophilologus* XVIII. 3. Pp. 161-240. Groningen, etc.: Wolters, 1933. Paper.
- Nesselhauf* (H.) Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der delisch-attischen Symmachie. Pp. vii+144. (Klio, Beiheft 30.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1933. Paper, M. 8.80.
- Nilsson* (M. P.) Homer and Mycenae. Pp. xii+283; 52 illustrations, 4 maps. (Methuen's Handbooks of Archaeology.) London: Methuen, 1933. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Ogle* (M. B.) and *Schullian* (D. M.) Rodulfi Tartarii Carmina. Pp. lx+500. (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. VIII.) Rome: American Academy, 1933. Cloth.
- Oppenheimer* (K.) Zwei attische Epitaphien. Pp. 97. Berlin: Ebering, 1933. Paper, RM. 2.70.
- Parke* (H. W.) Greek mercenary soldiers from the earliest times to the battle of Ipsus. Pp. viii+243. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1933. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Peake* (H.) and *Fleure* (H. J.) The Horse and the Sword. Pp. viii+152; 62 illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1933. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Peeters* (F.) A Bibliography of Vergil. Pp. 92. Bulletin XXVIII of The Service Bureau for Classical Teachers, April 1933. New York University. Paper, 40 cents (2s.).
- Pfeiffer* (E.) Virgils Bukolika. Untersuchungen zum Formproblem. Pp. 120. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933. Paper, M. 9.60.
- Rackham* (H.) Cicero de Natura Deorum, Academica. With an English translation. Pp. xix+664. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1933. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.



- Ranulf* (S.) *The Jealousy of the Gods and Criminal Law at Athens. A contribution to the sociology of moral indignation.* Pp. 161. London: Williams and Norgate (Copenhagen: Levin and Munksgaard), 1933. Paper.
- Reis* (P.), *Fruechtel* (L.), *Kasten* (H.) *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta . . .* Vol. VI, 1. *Oratio de Imperio Cn. Pompei, recognovit P.R.; Orationes p. Cluentio, de Lege Agr., p. C. Rabirio, rec. L. F.* Pp. xiv + 247. Vol. VI, 2. *Orationes in Catilinam IV, p. Archia, rec. P.R.; Or. p. Murena, p. Sulla, rec. H.K.; Or. p. Flacco, rec. L. F.* Pp. xxx + 256. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et R. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1933. Paper, RM. 8 and 8.40 (bound, 9.20 and 9.60.)
- Richardson* (B. E.) *Old Age among the Ancient Greeks. The Greek portrayal of old age in literature, art, and inscriptions.* Pp. xv + 376; 27 illustrations. (The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 16.) Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1933. Cloth, 24s. net.
- Robin* (L.) *Platon: Phédre. Texte établi et traduit.* (Collection des Universités de France. *Platon, Œuvres complètes: Tome IV—3<sup>e</sup> partie.*) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1933. Paper, 30 fr.
- Robinson* (D. M.) *Excavations at Olynthus. Part V. Mosaics, vases, and lamps of O. found in 1928 and 1931.* Pp. xxi + 297; 18 figures; 209 plates, etc. (The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 18.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1933. Cloth, 84s. 6d. net.
- Robinson* (D. M.) *Excavations at Olynthus. Part VI. The coins found at Olynthus in 1931.* Pp. xiv + 111; 2 figures, 30 plates. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1933. Cloth, 52s. 6d. net.
- Roes* (A.) *Greek Geometric Art Its symbolism and its origin.* Pp. 128. Haarlem: H. D. Tjeenk Willink en Zoon (London: Milford), 1933. Paper, 9s. net.
- Severyns* (A.) *Bacchylide. Essai biographique.* Pp. 181. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fasc. LVI.) Liège: Fac. de Philos. et Lettres (Paris: Droz), 1933. Paper, 40 fr.
- Smith* (W.) *A Smaller Latin-English Dictionary.* Revised edition by J. F. Lockwood. Pp. xi + 823. London: Murray, 1933. Cloth, 9s.
- Stegmann de Pritswald* (C.) *C. Vellei Paterculi . . . quae supersunt . . . iterum edidit . . .* Pp. xii + 176. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1933. Paper, RM. 5.80 (bound, 6.80).
- Stenzel* (J.) *Zahl und Gestalt bei Platon und Aristoteles. Zweite erweiterte Auflage.* Pp. viii + 188. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1933. Paper, RM. 10 (bound, 12).
- Stevens* (C. E.) *Sidonius Apollinaris and his Age.* Pp. xiv + 224. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1933. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Stubbe* (H.) *Die Verseinelagen im Petron eingeleitet und erklärt.* Pp. xiv + 186. (Philologus, Supplementband XXV, Heft II.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1933. Paper, M. 12 (bound, 14.)
- Svoboda* (K.) *L'Esthétique de Saint Augustin et ses Sources.* Pp. 207. (Opera Fac. Philos. Univ. Masarykianae Brunensis, 35). Brno (Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres'), 1933. Paper, Kč 35.
- Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum.* Volume II. *The Lloyd Collection, Parts I-II: Etruria to Thurium. 16 plates and letterpress.* London: Milford, 1933. Paper, 15s. net.
- Terzaghi* (N.) *Properzio. Elegie scelte e commentate.* Pp. 173. Naples: Perrella, 1933. Paper, L. 6.
- The Tebtunis Papyri.* Volume III. Part I. Edited by A. S. Hunt and J. G. Smyly. Pp. xix + 333; 7 plates. (University of California Publications, Graeco-Roman Archaeology, Vol. III.) London: Milford, 1933. Cloth and boards.
- Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association.* Vol. LXIII, 1932. Pp. 295 + clx. Published through the Secretary, R. C. Flickinger, State University of Iowa.
- Tredennick* (H.) *Aristotle, The Metaphysics, Books I-IX. With an English translation.* Pp. xxxvi + 473. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1933. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- van Buren* (A. W.) *A Bibliographical Guide to Latium and Southern Etruria. Third edition.* Pp. 34. *A Companion to the Study of Pompeii and Herculaneum.* Pp. 36. Rome: American Academy, 1933. Paper.
- Vessereau* (J.) et *Préchac* (F.) *Rutilius Namatianus sur son Retour. Texte établi et traduit.* (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1933. Paper, 12 fr.
- Vlasto* (P.) *Greek Bilingualism and Some Parallel Cases.* Pp. 87. Athens: printed at the "Hestia" Press, 1933. Paper, drs. 60 or 2s.
- Wassink* (J. H.) *Tertullian de Anima. Mit Einleitung, Uebersetzung und Kommentar.* Pp. 318. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1933. Paper, fl. 4.90.
- Wells* (A. F.) *Gaisford Prize for Greek Prose, 1933.* Pp. 11. *Wyllie* (T. H. S.) *Gaisford Prize for Greek Verse, 1933.* Pp. 13. Oxford: Blackwell, 1933. Paper, 2s. 6d. net each.
- West* (R.) *Römische Porträt-plastik.* Pp. xv + 264; 70 plates. Munich: Bruckmann, 1933. Cloth, RM. 80.
- Wittmann* (M.) *Die Ethik des hl. Thomas von Aquin.* Pp. xv + 398. Munich: Hueber, 1933. Paper, RM. 15 (bound, 17.50).
- Wölfflin* (E.) *Ausgewählte Schriften. Herausgegeben von G. Meyer. Mit Vorträgen von J. Stroux und G. Dittmann.* Pp. xi + 352; portrait. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1933. Paper, M. 13 (bound, 15).
- Woodhouse* (W. J.) *King Agis of Sparta and his Campaign in Arkadia in 418 B.C. A chapter in the history of the art of war among the Greeks.* Pp. x + 161; 4 maps and diagrams. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1933. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Yon* (A.) *Cicéron: Traité du Destin. Texte établi et traduit.* (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1933. Paper, 12 fr.

os.  
no  
er,

II.  
to  
n :

m-  
33-

I.  
p.  
nia  
gy,  
oth

an  
32.  
the  
ity

ics,  
on.  
ry.)  
os.

e to  
on.  
peli  
eri-

ma-  
et  
de  
33-

ome  
d at  
60

Mit  
tar.  
33-

ose,  
ford  
ord :

v +  
33-

mas  
ber,

aus-  
von  
352 ;  
per,

and  
A  
nong  
dia-  
lon :

exte  
iver-  
tres,